

APR 6 '40 M

The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 541

JULY, 1939

Vol. 273

1. The Vogue of Rumour.
By Montgomery Belgion.
 2. A Century of Postal Service.
By Dr Olga Illner.
 3. Spain, England, and the Duke of Alba.
By Michael Barrington.
 4. Delinquency and Psychology.
By Claud Mullins.
 5. The Great Chronicle of London.
 6. 'Frightfulness' in the Air.
By J. M. Spaight, C.B., C.B.E.
 7. Philosophic Foundations of Politics.
By Peter Legh.
 8. A Bird's-Eye View of the Balkans.
By J. Swire.
 9. The Letters of George IV.
By G. M. Young.
 10. The British Council in Europe.
By Frank Clements.
 11. The Gulf Stream and British Fisheries.
By Professor C. M. Yonge.
 12. The English Way of Life.
By Hugh Molson.
- Some Recent Books.

541-2

273

July-04

1939

274 543

K DA

13

Published Quarterly by

THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY

Sole Agents for American Continent

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

TO SUBSCRIBERS
AND AGENCIES

Commencing with the January 1938 issue of the "QUARTERLY REVIEW," Subscribers will be supplied by the INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY, 131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK CITY, to whom all renewals and enquiries regarding this periodical should be sent.

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 541.—JULY, 1939.

Art. 1.—THE VOGUE OF RUMOUR.

Is it not high time Colonel Blimp exclaimed, 'Gad, sir! Ezekiel was right!'? Certainly one prediction of the prophet's has been within recent years in striking course of fulfilment. There has come to be mischief upon mischief and rumour upon rumour. Much of the mischief is in the rumours, and, far from diminishing, the rumours steadily multiply. To-day they pour in upon us from all quarters—out of the East, from Central Europe, from Spain, from across the Atlantic, from Germany, from the Balkans, from Italy, from South America. They travel by word of mouth, by letter, by wireless, and by telephone and telegraph. And part of the mischief is that once again *Homo credulus* is in the ascendant. Sooner or later many of the rumours get exploded; but whether that is going to be its fate or not, nearly every one finds in the meanwhile an only too pliant acceptance. It does not seem to matter that some of them plumb new depths of the fantastic and preposterous. Of this I cannot resist giving two examples. In March a French Swiss wrote to me from Paris that Germans arriving in France from Germany had told him that the German Government was preparing to deliver an ultimatum to France in the following month, and would threaten, if the French declined to restore the German colonies, to bomb French towns within forty-eight hours. Since 1918 Germany has on no occasion made the slightest hostile move against France, and yet thousands of people in this country must have been ready to credit this tale. At about the same time as my French Swiss correspondent wrote to me, Sir Archibald Sinclair was asserting in the House of Commons

Vol. 273.—No. 541.

N Y P L

that Nationalist aviators had been dropping into the streets of Madrid imitation chocolate-boxes which, when children went to pick them up, exploded. Yet, apart from it being impossible that chocolate-boxes could reach the ground undamaged after a drop of one or more thousand feet, chocolates are in fact not eaten in Spain. The climate sees to that. But, as I say, to-day no tale from abroad can be too fantastic or preposterous for plenty of persons to entertain it. And if some of the rumours go to the very limit of imbecility, others obtain a more excusable credence by describing or predicting with deplorable ingenuity events that simulate all too closely what recent happenings have made us ready to expect. For instance, one day Germany is reported to be massing troops on the Dutch frontier; on another Italy is said to have arranged with General Franco to keep troops in Spain; and, next, pro-German agitators are stated to be fomenting an irredentist movement in Poland. Tales of this kind have acquired for us the similitude of likelihood. We cannot immediately disbelieve them. But they turn out not to be true.

It is perhaps going too far to speak of there having grown up of late years a cult of rumour, although in the last century the word 'cult' was imported into England anew from the French, being spelt with an 'e,' and in French *culte* may mean 'excessive veneration.' At any rate, it is not to be denied that rumour has lately come into vogue. Stories and gossip not only circulate among us orally or form the contents of certain mimeographed 'news-letters' read by their subscribers; under screaming headlines they are also given an irresistible dissemination by the press. Rumour and gossip, of course, are as old as the power of speech, but in the way our newspapers have taken within the last twelve to fifteen years to cultivating and relaying rumour we have, I feel, evidence of an attitude to truth and falsehood which seems to be new. In the years that have elapsed since the last war, our popular press has undergone a profound transformation the significance of which, it may be hoped, will one day be properly appreciated, but which in the meanwhile still awaits its historian. So far the transformation has taken place without really being noticed. No doubt never since they came into existence have our news-

papers abstained from printing rumours; but it used at any rate to be their custom clearly to indicate the nature of any rumour they printed—that is to say, to specify its source and to point out that it had so far not been confirmed—and also in the press thirty or forty years ago mere rumours were not as a rule given prominence. In those days, if a newspaper was tempted on some special occasion to print in heavy type and below large headlines a report which later turned out to be false, opinion grew indignant and those persons responsible for the conduct of the newspaper in question had the grace to avow a sense of shame.

During the Boxer rising of 1900 one of the halfpenny morning journals then recently set up in London made great play with a cablegram from Shanghai to the effect that there had been a massacre of the Europeans beleaguered in the legations at Peking. There is no question that this was then the rumour in Shanghai, but it turned out to be without foundation. Not only were the Europeans in Peking still safe, but a few weeks later they were relieved. The publication of the cablegram naturally aroused great anxiety, and when what it reported was found to be untrue there was an outcry. The prestige of the newspaper responsible suffered a heavy blow; it was about this time that the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, spoke of a paper run by office boys for office boys. Furthermore, so unusual was it in those days for an ill-judged publication of this nature to occur that the report of the 'Peking massacres' was long remembered, and from time to time derisive references to it went on being made, so that years afterwards it was still a tender subject with the editor of the paper and his lieutenants. To recall these consequences of the publication of a single false rumour forty years ago is to measure the extent to which the attitude of both editors and the public has changed. The press may not have sponsored lately any false report that numbers of English people had suffered a peculiarly cruel death, but no week passes when there are not printed in the guise of indisputable news any number of alarming rumours which eventually turn out to be either distortions of fact or else sheer inventions. And not only do editors fail to blush for this; that the contents of the papers are now

constantly misleading causes no stir. If it is notable enough that so much exaggerated or false news should now be featured in our press as if it were the announcement of fact, the really curious thing is that the public should connive at the practice and indeed apparently welcome it.

There have been protests, it is true. Now and then some man of the professional class is heard to remark in conversation that English evening newspapers seem to consider that they have an obligation to provide their readers with a daily 'sensation,' and that the sensations, most of them originating abroad, frequently turn out to be baseless. Time and again, in fact, the evening's 'sensation' is next morning's canard. For that matter, it is not to be maintained that our popular morning journals manifest scruples for truth or even for plausibility such as their evening contemporaries are said to dispense with. If the morning papers do not give renewed currency to those reports of the previous evening which have already been discredited before they go to press, they are prone to publish with lavish display other and later messages which likewise fail to get substantiated. Thus Mr J. Morris did not feel called upon to distinguish between morning and evening papers when, not very long ago, he asked in Parliament if the Prime Minister was aware 'that certain organs of the press during the past few years have continually published alarming statements regarding the international situation which in many cases are grossly exaggerated and in others false.' Almost at the same time as this question was being put in the House of Commons, another vehicle for the dissemination of news was being made the target of criticism. The British Broadcasting Corporation was being accused by a number of individual listeners of including in its evening news bulletins items from abroad which proper enquiry or even a ripe judgment might have caused it to withhold. Thus there have been protests. But they have been sporadic and few. As a whole, public opinion remains unmoved. Indeed, it is the newspapers which assiduously neglect to verify before printing the extravagant reports they receive that enjoy the largest circulation, so that, although much of the rumour and gossip that gets into print should, if it were true and its purport were

properly understood, send shivers of foreboding down the spines of readers, it would seem to have to be recognised that the constant opportunity of reading wild stories about international politics is relished by the mass of the public. This has led Sir Roderick Jones, the chairman of Reuter's News Agency, to speak of 'mankind's growing passion for world gossip and all that heightens the tension and intoxication of life.'

The explanation he offers of the change in our attitude to truth and falsehood is, as I propose to show, too simple. But unquestionably Sir Roderick Jones, as the distinguished head of one of the chief news agencies, has every reason to be alive to the changed situation. The news agencies form one channel through which this country comes to know of the alarming reports which spring into existence abroad and so often prove—but only after they have been spread among the public of this country—either exaggerated or false; and it may be said that the reports could not figure prominently in the newspapers or be included in the news bulletins of the B.B.C. if they were not first of all transmitted here from whatever places where they first get about. The B.B.C. in particular has no means of its own of gathering news overseas. The items which it broadcasts it simply selects from those that reach it from certain well-established agencies, of which, as may be noticed any evening, it invariably acknowledges the copyright. The greater part of our provincial press is in a like case. But the news agencies can hardly be blamed, nor for that matter can the staff correspondents whom the principal newspapers maintain abroad. One of our most influential journals remarked some time ago of the news agencies that 'they have tended more and more in recent years to cater for those who like colour.' If this is true, it can only be because colour has been exacted of the agencies by their customers—that is to say, by the newspapers taking agency services. Whatever their nationality, all news agencies have to reckon with the economic law of supply and demand. There is a certain famous foreign agency with an office in London which used to be proud of its reputation for sober news. But some years ago it found that the press of the country where it has its headquarters was neglecting its service in favour of that of a younger

rival, which had adopted the practice of circulating promptly any piece of international rumour or gossip it might happen to lay hands on. The result was that the old and famous agency took to transmitting unverified rumour and gossip also. A news agency must satisfy its customers, because it depends on the good will of its customers for continuing to exist. Likewise, the foreign correspondent of a newspaper must satisfy his editor or he will be replaced by someone who can. The responsibility for the publication nowadays in the press of so much wild rumour rests entirely with those who conduct our newspapers. It therefore needs to be asked how these men have been brought to set such little store by truth.

With them, needless to say, it has been a purely commercial matter—a question of sales. In that connection, I may point out that the report that the Boxers had massacred the Europeans in Peking was not the first piece of unconfirmed news to be propagated in 1900 by the halfpenny journal of which I spoke above. At the time the Boxers had raised the standard of revolt in China, Britain was at war with the Boers in South Africa, and a few months earlier this same paper had received from one of its correspondents at the seat of operations in Natal a circumstantial account of a surprise attack on a British column which involved the death of a number of officers. This account the paper took every means in its power to verify. The War Office, however, flatly denied that it could be true. In spite of the denial, the account was published, and eventually it proved to have been accurate in every respect. The consequence for the newspaper of having published an exclusive piece of accurate news of such moment was a great increase in prestige, and its sales took a gratifying leap upward. Its position, till then precarious, became assured. In publishing the report of a massacre of Europeans in Peking, the newspaper was simply attempting to bring off a second profitable coup. The attempt, as we have seen, was a failure; and for some years afterwards the general sentiment of our press was that the propagation of momentous but unverified rumour in the guise of the announcement of fact was too risky. But the lesson of the first success was not thereby invalidated. There is always the chance that a rumour, however fantastic or

however impossible to confirm at the moment, may turn out to be true; and this chance obsesses editors as the chance of winning enough to break the bank obsesses the gambler.

In the decade following the last European war the conditions of producing a newspaper in England grew difficult. There arose a breed of press barons who in the provinces either bought up existing journals or set up new ones; and each baron gave the chain of papers over which he thus gained control the benefit of a joint news service. Both in the provinces and in the metropolis competition became fierce and costs rose steeply. A newspaper derives its main revenue from advertising, and the prices it can charge for advertisements are usually in ratio to its sales. Several papers were now driven to the wall, but their disappearance by no means assured the survivors of an unchallenged *Lebensraum*. In the face of a need of larger revenue, newspaper proprietors instituted intensive canvassing. As an attraction to subscribers, gifts were offered and free insurances against accident. But experience showed that in the long run only one thing will make people buy a particular newspaper, and that is their finding its contents attractive. Thus it came about that first one and then another of our popular journals was led to adopt American methods of selecting and presenting news. For the working up and maintaining of the sales of a newspaper was an art which, in Europe still rudimentary, had in the United States long been brought to perfection. Also, as it happened, one of the new press barons was a Canadian, with first-hand knowledge of how across the Atlantic the art was pursued. There was indeed nothing mysterious about it. America had begotten what was known as the 'Yellow Press.' It had been found that the American newspaper-reading public had in the mass a very short memory and preferred the exciting to the accurate. The 'Yellow Press' consisted of those newspapers the editors of which bore these two characteristics in mind. The papers in question specialised in 'sensations.' For a while the 'sensations' were all obtained locally. Theodore Roosevelt's war on the trusts, the numerous scandals of American politics, and the eccentric behaviour of millionaires were among the features of American life that

constantly had the germ of sensation in them. But with the outbreak in August 1914 of the European war a new field was suddenly opened up to America's enterprising purveyors of wild and exciting 'news.' It is not too much to say that the American public now grew conscious of the existence of Europe for the first time. Furthermore, the War produced a never-failing supply of surmise, gossip, and fantasy, of which it was all the easier to take advantage as Europe had become the scene of actual events of a character to outstrip the most daring sensation-monger's imagination. Even so, American editors were not content with printing, however fantastic and exciting they might be, the tidings that came along; they shared the belief of the London morning journal which had published the premature report of a massacre in Peking: they believed that an indispensable means of increasing or keeping up circulation was the publishing of 'scoops'—that is to say, of exclusive pieces of information. Every American correspondent in Europe was impressed by his editor with the desirability whenever possible of obtaining the news ahead of anyone else. Time and again the haste thus induced led to 'intelligent anticipation.' For example, although the German plenipotentiaries, on their way to confer with Foch, did not pass through the fighting lines till Nov. 8, 1918, many American newspapers announced the day before that an armistice had been signed, with the result that the return of peace was being celebrated in various parts of the United States while away in France American soldiers were still inflicting or suffering destruction and death.

But the American newspaper-reading public did not mind. It wished only to be thrilled. Hence the printing of 'sensations' from Europe proved such 'a good thing' for American newspapers that editors never thought of giving up the practice when the War came to an end. By that time the American public had got into the habit of looking for news from Europe, and naïve as that public might be it could not help seeing that affairs in Europe were still far from being settled. Indeed, the peace was but nominal, and in the disorder bequeathed by the War the Old World went on generating all kinds of wild and exciting rumour. Revolutions and counter-revolutions

were going on, here and there separatists were active, in Paris the victors were wrangling over the terms to be imposed on Germany, and throughout Central and Eastern Europe there hovered the spectre of famine. On all sides the material of sensation lay to hand. It was too attractive to be ignored. No wonder the American press made full use of it! The quest of scoops continued. In 1922, when a party of English and American journalists visited Russia in order to report on conditions in the famine-stricken areas of the Volga basin, one of the Americans 'scooped' all his colleagues. They waited till they had seen evidences of hardship and privation before describing them. He relied instead on his imagination, and cabled a vivid account to his paper the moment the party arrived in Moscow.

The incident helps us to understand the American newspaper man's attitude to 'news.' This was the attitude adopted together with much else when during the nineteen twenties the men conducting English popular newspapers decided, one after the other, to invoke the aid of American methods in their efforts to increase and keep up their sales figures, so that the paper for which each was responsible might continue to subsist. The make-up, or putting together, of a page of news was revolutionised. From being an orderly array of columns in which the news items were set out under headings broadly uniform, it became the equivalent of a shaken-up jigsaw puzzle. Headings were given active verbs, and in growing shorter but larger ran the risk of being unintelligible. The actual news-matter had perforce to be modified to match this altered presentation. It became largely a medley of galvanic shocks. So far as the record of events at home was concerned, sub-editors concentrated on 'the human drama' and the trivial imbroglio. Occasional complaints of intrusion on the privacy of persons unexpectedly bereaved have afforded a clue to the activities which enable the popular papers to be so well informed regarding what are often purely family matters. As for international affairs, the same reliance was placed on rumour and gossip that the American 'Yellow Press' had been showing in respect of news from Europe. The guiding principle seemed to have become 'sensation' at all costs. In the autumn of

1935, on the eve of the application of sanctions against Italy by the League of Nations, an agency message reported that English people were being molested in the streets of Rome. A daily with a huge circulation had no resident correspondent in that city, but one of its staff happened to be there on holiday. He was rung up on the telephone and asked if he could not supply additional colour to the agency report. He replied that on the contrary he himself had been treated with every courtesy by the Romans and that he had not seen the least sign of hostility to any foreigner. Nevertheless, because sensational, the agency report was printed. Again, when in December 1938 demonstrations by and against Italians in Tunisia caused the French Government to send *gardes mobiles* (special police) from Algiers to Tunis, a leading London morning paper reported the news under the heading: 'Troops Rushed to Tunisia.' 'Troops' is a word that sounds more exciting than 'police.'

It is not to be suggested that editors do not know their business. The production of a successful popular newspaper may be no more than the quasi-mechanical application of a few almost childish simple rules. Nevertheless those rules really have been mastered. The journals with the largest sales to-day are those which not merely expatiate on private scandal and misfortune and on the human and gossiping aspects of politics and foreign affairs, but also employ with consummate skill the arts of arresting and holding a vagrant attention. But it remains that by a misplaced emphasis, which is directed by pre-occupation with sensation rather than with truth, our press gives a thoroughly distorted picture of world events. We are supposed to read the papers in order to learn what is going on; actually, there is no surer way of having what is going on concealed from us. How is it that the garbling of the news should be so successful? The suggestion put forward by Sir Roderick Jones that mankind has developed a 'passion for world gossip and all that heightens the tension and intoxication of life' does not answer this question. It only describes the situation from the side of the public; it does not explain how that situation can have come about. One thing, certainly, is that now, far more than thirty or forty years ago, the newspapers are read by the masses, and that the

masses in this country know and can understand as little about international politics as do the masses in the United States. According to the 'Report on the British Press' that was issued some months ago by the organisation known as P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning), nine out of ten English newspaper readers have had only an elementary education, and many of the nine received that education at a time when the curriculum was more rudimentary than it is to-day. Few newspaper readers have been abroad. For them the existence of other countries remains shadowy, and that the inhabitants of those countries are people very much like themselves is a fact which they cannot visualise. As regards foreign affairs, it is, apart from the great simple issues of peace and war, only the dramatic and sinister that can be brought home to them. Moreover, people read the papers largely in order to forget, if only for some moments, the drab and dreary character of their own lives. Hence the more sinister and dramatic events abroad can be made to appear by our press, the more the account of those events will be appreciated by newspaper readers. Then also it is evident that, if the masses are ignorant, our so-called educated classes are both ill-informed and deficient in judgment. For otherwise how could the announcement on the midday newsbills of one London evening paper, 'Duce Calls Up 1,000,000 Men,' cause almost a panic in the City, as it did on March 2 last? Few exaggerations have been more quickly exposed. At 6 p.m. on the same day another paper stated that, according to Reuter, the number of men called up was only between 20,000 and 60,000, and that the British United Press put the maximum number at 30,000. Next day, moreover, it became clear that the men called to the colours were simply some who had not completed their period of military service.

But it is not simply that newspaper readers are in the mass ignorant and lacking in judgment or that they have an insatiable appetite for 'sensations.' Rumour and gossip from abroad not only fill our press; they also, as I began by pointing out, circulate among us by word of mouth. The fact is that we are living in a time particularly propitious to the breeding and spread of wild and alarming tales. That too must have had its share in causing our press to abandon the scruples for accuracy

formerly characteristic of British journalism. Conditions at present have indeed a kinship with those of the days that followed the outbreak of the last war. It was then that within living memory rumour first began to acquire its new power and importance in England. Some of the stories that gained universal currency in those days were so eloquent of the powers of human imagination and of the extent of human credulity that they have become legendary. There was, for example, the tale according to which angels had appeared to some of the British soldiers engaged in the fighting at Mons, and the tale that 400,000 Russian soldiers had passed through England on their way to reinforce the line in France. It will be instructive to consider how those two rumours grew so immensely popular.

In the first place, we see that they arose at a time of excitement, anxiety, and uncertainty. Rumour depends on uncertainty. Whenever we know the truth of an event, we lend no ear to rumour. No doubt the whole truth never can be known to everybody, but there are periods when the community feels greater or less uncertainty. Wartime, and especially the interval that occurs between the outbreak of hostilities and the settling down of the campaign into something resembling routine, sees uncertainty at its maximum. Not only is information deliberately held back in the interests of military operations, but there is inevitably a great deal of confusion. For the public to ascertain what is really happening becomes impossible, and we are thrown into uncertainty. The way for rumour lies open. Furthermore, the period following the outbreak of a war is one of excitement and anxiety. Excitement is bred by the sudden change in the mode of life of the community and by a more or less clear consciousness of the threat to our private relations and arrangements, our private hopes and ambitions. And because of the uncertainty and excitement there is anxiety. We wonder what is going to happen. We easily anticipate the worst. Thus, at the same time as the way is open for rumour to spread, we are made more receptive and credulous. Now, as American editors were the first to realise, the end of the War in 1918 did not put an end to the sense of uncertainty which the War had produced. We had been promised when the War should

have been won an era of 'open diplomacy.' The squabbles of the Peace Conference quickly showed that 'open diplomacy' was impossible. It was naturally sought to minimise and conceal for as long as possible the disagreements that broke out among the delegates to that conference. The secrecy thus observed gave, as secrecy always does give, a free tongue to gossip. Nor did conditions improve when the conference was over. The campaigns to overthrow the Bolsheviks in Russia which the Allies undertook or supported, the fears of Germany which the French began entertaining the moment the Treaty of Versailles had been signed, the anarchy that arose in Italy, the struggle for a large part of Asia Minor that involved Turks and Greeks in a war of their own, the financial plight of Central Europe, Signor Mussolini's momentary seizure of Corfu—all these things perpetuated the unsettled atmosphere first brought about by the War. Then, with the advent at the beginning of 1933 of Herr Hitler to the command of affairs in Germany, a new era of uncertainty was ushered in. Unquestionably Herr Hitler began by showing a readiness to come to terms with the Western Powers. But apparently—it is what Nazis say—he soon grew convinced that rather than reach decisions they preferred to take refuge in interminable discussion. For fifteen years they had been holding international conferences, either at Geneva or in pleasant out-of-the-way corners, and yet general contentment was still remote. So presently he decided to act, and to act independently. From that moment he began springing a series of bold and dramatic surprises on the world. The withdrawal of Germany from the League of Nations, the restoration of German military service, the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, the annexation of Austria, the annexation of the Sudetenland, the invasion of Czecho-Slovakia with its declaration of a protectorate, and the annexation of Memel—each one of these strokes was swift and sudden. The League's censure of Italy's campaign against Abyssinia drove Signor Mussolini into alliance with Germany, and when last April Signor Mussolini expelled the king from Albania and made that hitherto Italian protectorate an autonomous Italian province, it was by steps in strict imitation of Hitlerian procedure. Both men have come to appear

incalculable, and at a moment when Europe has been arrayed in two hostile camps, all the uncertainty, anxiety, and excitement of wartime once again prevail.

In the second place, it is to be noted that in 1914 the stories of the angels at Mons and of the 400,000 Russians in England were passed from one person to another largely because both these stories seemed to be 'inside information.' It pleased people to be able to repeat such tales and also to embellish them. At the end of August 1914 I was in Paris, and I remember getting into talk one afternoon in the Avenue de l'Opéra with a stray British soldier who, when I asked him about the Russians, assured me that he had himself seen a contingent of them somewhere in the north of France. Perhaps he had seen strange troops, Belgian or French; but certainly he derived a natural satisfaction from appearing to have special knowledge. A similar desire to seem informed is at work to-day. The international uncertainty of the last few years, itself already so favourable to the propagation of rumour, has been much intensified by the strict censorship that has been established in such countries as Russia, Italy, and Germany. Foreign newspaper correspondents in those countries find it difficult to ascertain what is really happening, and they come to rely on any source of information they can get in touch with. This difficulty, moreover, makes them the more eager to be, as people in England in 1914 were eager to be, 'in the know.' If so much rumour and gossip now reaches us from abroad, we are entitled to suppose that it is partly owing to the human desire of the journalists responsible and of the persons with whom they consort to feel that they have 'inside information.'

In the third place, the stories about the angels at Mons and about the 400,000 Russians in England were, at the time they were being circulated and accepted, stories such as people were all disposed to believe. The French armies and our own Expeditionary Force were then in full retreat before the German onrush. The outlook was dark and threatening. That angels had appeared to some of our soldiers at Mons was a report providing much needed encouragement. It was an assurance that heaven was, as usual, on our side. Likewise, that as many as 400,000 Russians—a body five and a half times

the size of the force we had sent to France—should have passed through England was a promise that we should be able to stem the tide in the West. There has never been any evidence that the authorities had a share in promoting either story. They were otherwise occupied. But the stories could not have been more effective if they had been deliberately invented for the purpose of rallying British morale. We may infer from this that the most successful rumours—that is to say, those that obtain the widest currency and acceptance—are rumours of events which large numbers of people would like to have had occur. If we consider certain tales that have been widely circulated of late, we see that there are plenty of people to wish that they also were true. Reports of disaffection in Italy and Germany, of financial embarrassment, of the failure of harvests, and so on—reports such as have frequently been current in recent years—belong to this class. Neither Fascism in Italy nor National Socialism in Germany ever tried to conciliate or placate political opposition. Of both, the political opponents have been either imprisoned or driven into exile. And the exiles have found many friends in the so-called democracies. At any rate till recently, numerous Englishmen and Frenchmen disapproved of the dictatorships, not out of the fear that the ambitions of the dictators would become inordinate, but because the triumph of these dictators had sounded in Germany and Italy the knell of their own political ideals. It is on that account that, by political exiles from Germany and Italy and by such English or French friends of theirs, no design has been too sinister or too preposterous to be attributed to Herr Hitler or to Signor Mussolini. There is, indeed, ground for wondering if certain reports that have been put forward were not inspired by somebody's desire to discredit the dictatorships in the opinion of the inhabitants of the democracies. In 1916 there was, it will be remembered, the myth of the German corpse factory, a myth which, to the extent it gained credence, increased among the populations of the Allied countries their execration of Germany. In fact, this myth was clearly used for what has since come to be known as propaganda. As the War wore on, reports were more and more put about with a propagandist intent, and the use of rumour in

the service of propaganda did not cease with the Armistice. On the contrary, it is easy to think of occasions when rumour must have had an ulterior motive. In 1924, for instance, the fate of a general election was determined by the publication on the eve of the poll of what purported to be a letter written by the Russian politician Zinoviev. Whether or not such a letter was ever actually penned, it had certainly not been seen by those who put into circulation the report that it had. The story of the Zinoviev letter was a propagandist rumour. However, no Zinoviev letter could have been reported as having been written had it not been that Russian propaganda was being actively carried on both here and in France. If that propaganda has now virtually ceased in England, in France it still goes on, and there it has never been suspended. Nor can we feel confident that the Communists are the only people who have been engaged in political propaganda within recent years. We know that Nazi agents are busy in Denmark, Scandinavia, Holland, Belgium, Switzerland, and the United States. And there may be propagandists of other political hues at work in different parts of the Continent and also here in England. People, as they pass on a tale, have a tendency, as I pointed out just now, to embroider it. Every piece of rumour or gossip is transformed as it travels, so that eventually a more or less alarming report may seem to have been put forward by someone with an axe to grind when its original transmitters were perhaps guiltless. Nevertheless, certain of the rumours which have been most widely spread within the last few years, but only to prove false, do look as if at no stage can they have been quite innocent. In May 1938, for example, there was a report that Germany had mobilised her army, and it was on the strength of this report that the Czechs thereupon mobilised theirs. But there had been no German mobilisation. Again, precisely on the day following the German declaration of a protectorate over Slovakia, the report gained currency in London that Germany had delivered an ultimatum to Rumania, although, as was shown a few days later, there had been no such ultimatum. Who can be satisfied that the choice of a date for putting forth this false report was purely fortuitous?

Altogether, then, it may be said that if in the course of the last ten to fifteen years we have gradually adopted a new attitude to truth and falsehood, so that a veritable vogue of rumour has arisen, there have been four contributory factors: (1) To the extent rumour and gossip from abroad are propagated by the press, that is done entirely in order to raise and maintain sales. (2) The public, ignorant for the most part of international problems, gives evidence of liking to read disturbing 'news,' the full import of which it fails to grasp. (3) We are living in a period of uncertainty and excitement as great as that of wartime; and to enjoy passing on rumours, however fantastic or alarming, is a human characteristic. (4) It is not impossible that agencies of propaganda are at work.

If, however, the busy traffic in rumour has been a great commercial asset to the popular press, provides the mass of the public with thrills, and must cause any secret propagandists there may be to rub their hands gleefully, its effect on business generally is pernicious. It has brought into being that new disease which Americans aptly name 'the jitters,' and the disease is especially prevalent on the Stock Exchange. Any untoward event occurring on the Continent, even if trivial in itself, is interpreted by stockbrokers as a portent of disaster. In January the news that stones had been thrown through the windows of a German consulate in Holland was enough to cause prices to break, although that was hardly an incident to set Europe in turmoil. Herr Hitler's annual speech to the Reichstag on Jan. 30 was awaited with what proved to be needless foreboding, so that the day after it had been delivered certain industrials were marked up as much as 10 per cent. Would the Stock Exchange have grown so nervous if a stream of disturbing rumour, usually with little or no foundation, had not for the last few years been undermining confidence? We may doubt it. Since January there have been particular days—March 23 was one of them—when dealings in stocks and shares were wholly influenced by 'a mass of alarming reports' which, as a City editor pertinently said, 'had no foundation in fact.' Although informed City opinion was well aware that the consequence could not be an immediate European war, there were heavy falls on

March 17 and 18 following the news that Germany had set up a protectorate over what had been Czecho-Slovakia, and on the 20th there was a general collapse. What happens on the Stock Exchange but reflects the feeling now common among business men at large. For our confidence and peace of mind actual events have been sufficiently disturbing. When in addition so many wild and alarming rumours get trumpeted by our press, it is inevitable that investors should grow timorous and that men should shrink from embarking upon long-term commitments, with the result that enterprise is threatened by a partial paralysis. Yet at a time when the Government is undertaking unparalleled expenditure, the prosperity of our trade has never been more requisite.

To urge moral objections against the way in which of late years we have increasingly cultivated rumour—as it must seem, merely for rumour's sake—would doubtless sound visionary. But the ill consequences apparent in the practical domain surely deserve to be reckoned with. It is true that in the eyes of anyone who still values truth matters have not yet become as bad as they may. However numerous at present may be the reports either exaggerated or false that are propagated, the exaggeration in them or the falsity does soon become known. The freedom which allows the press to propagate falsehood and fantasy also ensures that the falsehood or fantasy is exposed. But it is only too easy to conceive that there may come a time when we shall be assailed with exaggerated and false reports from the rest of the world and never see them contradicted.

MONTGOMERY BELGION.

Art. 2.—A CENTURY OF POSTAL SERVICE.

YEAR by year the daily wonders of the post have grown into our lives until they have become so intimate a part of it that we scarcely notice them. But even so they are there and if anyone tried to deprive us of the great postal benefits of our age we would soon realise to what extent we have become enslaved to the most popular of state institutions. Yet it is but a hundred years since the foundation was laid which made the development and scope of our modern Post Office a reality : a development that was launched on the very day that the House of Commons adopted Sir Rowland Hill's famous Penny Postage Bill. In fact, July 12, 1839, may well be termed the birthday of the modern Post Office. We can only fully appreciate the truth of that by shedding a light on what was then politely called a ' postal service.'

The initial cost of letter transport was so high that only the well-to-do could afford the luxury of correspondence. Fourpence would carry a letter but fifteen miles. Above that mileage the average rate in England moved in the environment of sixpence-halfpenny. Sixpence was then the third of a working man's daily wages, and we can understand the indignation of Mr Buwin, who reported his impression on the situation to the Parliamentary Commission which had been set up to make enquiries into postal conditions. ' Sixpence is the third of a poor man's daily wages,' he said in his report. ' If a gentleman whose income is 100*l.* a year would have to pay one-third of his daily income for a letter, how many letters of friendship would he write ? ' A letter to Gibraltar was charged 2*s.*, to Egypt 3*s.* A three-pound packet of manuscript to these countries was charged 5*l.* And if it happened to be but one ounce overweight it had to go as a letter, costing the fantastic amount of 22*l.* 8*s.*

These enormous charges on the one side were faced by an incredible abuse of the franking system on the other. This system enabled the sender—provided he was an M.P. or in the diplomatic service—to render his letters exempt from postal charges merely by signing his name outside. Actually, this privilege was meant to be enjoyed only by Members of Parliament during each session. In fact, however, these people signed letters by

the stack thereafter, giving them away to their constituents as a much-coveted present. There were even cases when these franks were given to servants to eke out their wages. And those of them who could not write would always find a willing buyer for them. The extent to which this abuse extended may be inferred from actual cases. For example, it has been recorded that a pianoforte and a horse and even two servant girls were sent as part of the 'ambassador's bag.' In 1716 the franked letters—not counting those which were on 'His Majesty's Service'—amounted to 17,500 a year. By 1838 they had reached the respectable figure of 7,000,000, causing a total loss to the Post Office of 1,065,000*l*. Forgery of franks was a daily occurrence, and even the hanging of the Rev. Dr Dodd at Tyburn for that offence had little deterrent effect on a population which, not without justification, considered that they had a legitimate right to correspond with each other.

The forging of franks was quite openly practised with newspapers. There was a rule according to which no newspaper could be posted in any town for delivery within the same circle unless an extra charge of one penny was charged for that privilege. Ingenious newspaper proprietors found a way out. The papers due for delivery in London, for instance, were sent down to Gravesend by river and posted there. The Post Office had no choice but to cart them back all the way to London free of charge. The length to which otherwise honest people would go to defraud the Post Office seems almost fantastic. Some people, taking advantage of the fact that newspapers went free, would address them in such a way that the recipient could easily read a message from them. Thus 'Mr John Smith, grocer, tea-dealer, 1 High Street, Edinburgh' would tell the recipient that his remittance had been received and that sugar was falling. When the name was spelt in a different way or written in different ink, the whole message would take on an entirely different meaning.

Pre-paid postage was completely unknown, a fact which hampered greatly the speed and efficiency of the postal service. The post-boy was forced to wait on every doorstep until the recipient had collected the money to pay for the letter. For the poorer the receipt of a letter was

quite a trial. Paying the fee often meant to them going short of food for some days and more often than not they found it altogether impossible to scrape the money together. One can imagine the dilemma of a kind postmaster who had to choose between his loyalty to the Post Office and his pity for some old woman waiting anxiously for news from a far-off son. Into this chaos stepped Rowland Hill with his ingenious reform plans. Although he failed to obtain admission to the Post Office, he succeeded in collecting sufficient material to prove the soundness of the main features of his scheme. He realised that postal revenue in England had been falling for the last twenty years, while France, working on much lower rates, could pride herself on a fairly prosperous Post Office. He also realised that the length of a letter's journey made hardly any difference to the cost of that journey. His demonstration of that fact was so obvious that one can hardly understand that anybody in his mind could oppose such simple truth.

As an example he took the average cost of the journey London-Edinburgh, which was 5*l*. He then worked out the cost of each hundredweight, presuming an average load of six hundredweight. One hundredweight would thus work out at 16*s*. 8*d*. Taking the average weight of a letter as a quarter of an ounce, the actual charge for one letter should have been $\frac{1}{32}$ of a penny. In fact, however, it amounted to 1*s*. 3½*d*. Sir Rowland Hill's answer was a uniform rate of one penny and prepayment of all charges. Hill's proposals were submitted to Lord Melbourne's government in 1837, but he preached to deaf ears. The only way left seemed to address himself to the letter-writing public, and thus was sent on its way the most popular pamphlet ever written, entitled 'Postal Reform.' Two simple words, but they went home with the force and accuracy of an axe blow. The poor people welcomed it as the greatest step forward in social reform that had yet been seen by the nineteenth century. The mercantile community hailed it as a new and promising incentive to business. Within a year of the publication of the famous pamphlet there were 300 petitions to Parliament, and twelve months later the number of petitions signed for penny postage to come in had reached the quarter-million.

Nevertheless, Rowland Hill found himself faced with unrelenting hostility from official and particularly from Post Office circles. Lord Lichfield, the Postmaster-General at the time, pleaded that the mails would have to carry twelve times as much weight as before if Hill's plan were to be adopted. 'The walls of the Post Office would burst!' he exclaimed. 'The whole area in which the building stands would not be large enough to receive the letters!' An argument which can be more readily understood was the view held by many people that it seemed unfair for anybody to have all the trouble of writing a letter and then having to pay for it on top of it. Another argument which was brought forth quite seriously was that increased deliveries would inconvenience the public. Rowland Hill and his friends, however, were undaunted in their enthusiasm. So convinced were they of the profound soundness of his calculations that they approached the reluctant Government with a proposal to found a private company for the introduction of a penny post. For the granting of the privilege the company was prepared to pay a substantial royalty to the State.

Strangely enough, the eventual passing of the Penny Postage Bill was not due to public pressure alone—though this was considerable—but to a minor governmental crisis. In 1839 Lord Melbourne's government brought in the 'Jamaica Bill' proposing to suspend the Constitution of that colony for five years. This Bill carried a majority of only five, and the Cabinet had to resign. Peel, who was called upon to form the new Cabinet, completely failed in the endeavour. Lord Melbourne's return was then made possible by the Radicals, who promised their support in return for penny postage. Thus, as Sir Rowland Hill's son remarked somewhat bitterly, 'One of the greatest social reforms ever introduced was given as a bribe by a tottering Government to secure political support.' All the same, the country was jubilant when penny postage finally won the day on July 12, 1839. The general feeling is well illustrated by a letter from Harriet Martineau to Sir Rowland Hill. 'We are all putting up our letter boxes with great glee,' she wrote, and then went on describing the joy of the poor, who could 'at last write to each other as though they were all M.P.s!'

Though Sir Rowland Hill fully deserves the credit of having fought for and introduced the greatest reform in postal history, he cannot claim to have been the real inventor of the system. In fact, there had been a penny post in London, the famous Dockwra Penny Post, which became the twopenny post during the Napoleonic wars. France can actually lay claim to the honour of having run a penny post two hundred years before anybody thought of it in England. In 1653 Louis XIV gave a forty years' monopoly to the Comte de Nogente 'for the establishment in our good city of Paris and our other cities of a local post.' The idea was to erect pillar boxes in different parts of the town. Letters, irrespective of distance, should be wrapped in a billet costing one *sol* and inscribed 'poste payé.' No letter would be forwarded without prepayment in the fashion described. The French penny post was a rather short-lived experiment, but it greatly influenced the low rates which were operated later and enabled the French Post Office to pay its way a long time before the general reform.

Penny postage having won the day, the Lords of the Treasury had to come to some agreement as to the method of prepayment. In his pamphlet Sir Rowland Hill had suggested the solution: 'Perhaps the difficulties might be obviated by using a bit of paper just large enough to bear the stamp and covered at the back with a glutinous wash which by applying a little moisture might be attached to the back of the letter.' Thus came the first original conception of the postage stamp. At first, however, the famous stamped Mulready envelope took its place. The first actual penny stamp in black was finally printed by Joseph Baker, who had himself acquired the patent of printing adhesive stamps from Joseph Perkins, an American.

When penny postage had become a reality the first results seemed rather discouraging. During the first year of its operation it involved a loss of one million pounds to the postal revenue, and the numerous critics lost no time in raising warning voices. But the transition period being surmounted, the rise of the number of letters written and in the postal revenue was really spectacular. In 1839, before penny postage had been introduced, the number of letters which passed the post was 79 millions.

By the end of 1840 that number had risen to 169 millions and by 1864 it had jumped to 642 millions. To-day the number of letters and packets (not parcels) delivered in a year has reached the astronomical figure of 7,990,000,000. Before Rowland Hill the gross postal revenue was 2,340,000*l.*, of which no less than 1,659,000*l.* was clear profit. The introduction of the penny post, after first involving a loss of one million to the postal revenue, caused it to rise steadily until in 1879 it had reached 6,982,537*l.*, which meant a net revenue of 2,601,380*l.* To-day the total value of the Post Office's transactions with the public is 1,026,064,000*l.*; the net revenue being 12,307,000*l.*

The greatest ally of the new spirit which carried the Post Office forward on an unprecedented scale of success was the coming of steam. The 'Puffing Billy' had fired the imagination of a century. Even before Rowland Hill the Post Office had recognised the great importance of the new invention for mail carriage. On May 9, 1831, the Post Office signed its first contract with the Liverpool and Manchester Railway. In July 1837, when the Grand Junction Railway was opened to join the old line with Birmingham, the Post Office achieved what was then considered a great feat. Under the supervision of Colonel Maberley, Secretary to the Post Office, the mail was sent to Liverpool and Manchester in the record time of 16½ hours.

The problem next arose as to how the mail was to be transported to and from the steam transport system with the least possible delay. This problem was solved by the introduction of the 'Travelling Post Office.' Not quite the modern, cleverly designed, speedy and efficient type. As a matter of fact, it was an old adapted horse-box which was pressed into service for the first six months of the experiment. In the meantime the first genuine travelling post office was built by the Grand Junction Railway under Nathaniel Worsdell's supervision, and was fitted with an apparatus which could exchange the bags at a considerable speed. This process was not without its difficulties. Of necessity the apparatus points from which the iron arm of the travelling post office would hook the mail-bags were much nearer together than they are to-day. Some of them were separated merely by a distance of five

miles. To hook the bag, sort it, make up a new bag in four to five minutes was no mean thing, even for the sorter with deft fingers. No wonder that some of these sections were known as the 'galloping round.'

Even to-day work on the travelling post office can hardly be called monotonous. But in the old days it was often fraught with danger. The old Highland Railway in particular was famed for major and minor accidents, due to the terrific force of the gales, which rooted up whole trees and hurled them across the line. Some fifty years ago when a terrific gale swept Sutherland a tree was hurled against the mail van, smashing it to pieces like so much matchwood. The sorter escaped almost miraculously. Another time the travelling post office was hurled over an embankment. It landed on the beach below, imprisoning the sorter beyond any chance of escape. In the true spirit of the Post Office, however, the victim was more concerned about the fate of his letters, which were swept away one by one by the incoming tide, than about his own safety. When aid arrived eventually the victim's first thought was for the letters entrusted to his care, and luckily most of them were recovered from the muddy beach.

This part of the Post Office's work is dismissed easily enough by the sophisticated, who loathe the very smell of the twopenny library 'Brave Little Man' story. But these things, perhaps more than anything, reveal that spirit of service in which the Post Office has managed to train a staff that might well be called a 'valiant army of delivery.' That spirit seems to be inherent in postal service all over the world, and Kipling has found beautiful words for the mail-runner's fate :

Is the torrent in the spate ? He must for it or swim.
Has the rain wrecked the road ? He must climb by the cliff.
Does the tempest cry halt ? What are tempests to him ?
The service admits not a 'but' nor an 'if.'
While the breath's in his mouth he must bear without fail
In the name of the Emperor the Overland Mail.

Even to-day in the age of air-mail the ground job has still to be done, and it is not always without its dangers. Take the postman in India who must cross long, uninhabited stretches of jungle or deserted road. How often

have there been reports of a mail-runner being mauled by tigers? The same is true of Africa. In Turkestan even to-day he may be assailed by robbers and wild beasts when travelling across bridges which are mere ropes and across mountain streams which have never been bridged at all. To-day life in a travelling post office may not be quite so romantic, but it is all the more strenuous. Efficiency, accuracy, and steady nerves are paramount.

When the travelling post office was first launched it was soon realised in official circles that it would be necessary to come to some agreement with the railways that would ensure a regular and efficient service. In the Railway Regulations Act of 1844 a minimum speed of 27 m.p.h. for trains conveying mails was insisted on. The first post van, which was the cause of great merriment for the passengers of the mail-train, was soon followed by others, until to-day the Post Office commands a whole fleet of them, covering a mileage of four million miles. The number of bags made up in the London and Preston travelling post office down night mail was 51, and in the up mail 44. The first purely mail-train began to run between London and Bristol in 1885. To-day there are four mail-trains. The Up Special from Aberdeen to Euston is the largest. It is, in fact, the largest travelling post office in the world. It has six coaches and deals with 1800 bags of mail every night, with a crew of eighty sorters at work.

Actually the Post Office made use of steam long before it signed its first contract with the Liverpool and Manchester Railway. Steam was used to keep up the service to Ireland as early as 1816. In 1821 the steamer 'Lightning' was run for postal service between Holyhead and Dublin. These early experiments with steam proved such a success that before long the Post Office bought up some small steamers for the conveyance of mail to France, Belgium, Sweden, and Germany. When the possibility of a regular conveyance of ocean mail by steam took on a more definite shape, the two big ship-builders of the time embarked on a contest for the honour of launching the first steamship to carry the mail-bags to America's shores.

The British Queen Company got to work on a ship of the same name, while the Great Eastern Company under the guidance of the famous Brunel started work on the

'Great Eastern' in their Thameside yards. When the British Queen Company realised that the running would end badly for her she set out to charter the only steamship available at the time. This was the 'Sirius,' engaged on cross-Channel service. The voyage of the 'Sirius' in the spring of 1838 with 300 letters stowed away in her hold is a tale of undaunted courage. When she departed from Cork her crew were conscious of two things only : first, of the honour of sailing as a pioneer ship with His Majesty's Mail and, second, of the fact that this journey was undertaken in a ship which was really not built for the western ocean run. There came a point when the 'Sirius' found herself in such difficulties that the crew, with some justification, demanded her return. A less courageous commander would have probably given in. As it was, she battled on challenging the heavy seas and after a seventeen-day struggle proudly delivered the first mail which had crossed the Atlantic by steam.

Encouraged by the great public appeal of that voyage of the 'Sirius,' the Post Office in 1839 sent out invitations to tender for a subsidised mail service to America. And it is from this moment that we are able to see the development of the world's great shipping companies, many of which owed their very existence to the securing of a mail contract. One of the leaflets sent out by the Post Office on this occasion fell into the hands of Samuel Cunard, representative of a big trading company in Nova Scotia. He sailed for England determined to secure the contract. It was not easy to find the capital needed for the foundation of a steamship company, but determination eventually succeeded where introductions failed. Samuel Cunard not only got his steamship company together, but also secured the much-coveted mail contract. With one of his small steamers, the 'Britannia,' he organised the first regular steamship service to the shores of young America in 1840. The Post Office paid him a subsidy of 49,000*l.* for his services.

Whenever a mail contract was near expiry the Post Office would advertise for new tenders, thus making sure that the subsidy would always go to that company which was able to offer the cheapest and the quickest service. A healthy spirit of competition thus sprang up which made the passenger service across the seas much

more efficient than it would have been without the incentive of the coveted mail contract. In fact, several of the greatest shipping firms trace their early beginnings to the securing of a mail contract. The Union Castle Line, for instance (then only the Union Line), began its career by carrying letters to South Africa. When the Crimean War broke out the Union Line possessed but a few small colliers. These were rushed away to replace the Post Office steamers, which had to be utilised for war transport. The Crimean War ended, the owners of the Union Line had to look out for new charters for the ships left on their hands. South American trade did not prove very lucrative, and just when things looked very dark indeed for the Union Line the Government advertised a contract for the conveyance of mail to South Africa. The Union Line was quick to secure it, and thus had climbed the first step towards one of the proudest names in the shipping world. For a long time the Admiralty insisted that every mail-carrying ship was to be accompanied by a naval officer who could intervene if and when the necessity arose to deal with disciplinary matters. This state of affairs lasted until 1860, when, on its own accord, the Admiralty decided to give up the rather obsolete procedure. Full control over the mail-ships thereafter passed to the Post Office.

The possibilities of steam were still unexhausted when other great inventions started to grip public imagination. Among these the telegraph and the telephone seemed to hold the promise of a new age. From the very first it was realised that enormous commercial possibilities were slumbering in the strange coils and wires which went into the making of the telegraph. But the public at large became telegraph-conscious only after the new invention had played a startling rôle in the capture of a murderer, who was arrested within a few hours after his victim had been discovered. Voices were raised within the Post Office clamouring that the telegraph, as the natural sister of the mail service, should be brought under Post Office jurisdiction. For the time being, however, the Post Office thought it wiser to watch the progress of the few private telegraph companies which had sprung up here and there and to learn from their experiences—experiences which were not altogether happy.

The main drawback of the private telegraph system was the circumstance that only the big cities were connected, while the small places, showing distinctly less possibilities for commercial profits, were sadly neglected. Furthermore, the question of delivery was one that gave rise to continuous complaint from the public. To greater or lesser extent the telegraph companies depended on the good will or otherwise of the railway staff for the delivery of their telegrams. More often than not the railway's own messages were seen to first, a procedure which meant enormous delay to the telegraph company's messages. Not unnaturally, the public paying high rates for the services made bitter complaints, and the pressure of public opinion became so strong that the control of the telegraph was transferred to the Post Office in 1870 at the cost of 10,000,000*l.* Three years later the number of messages dealt with had risen from seven million to fifteen million. The uniform rate of 1*s.* 3*d.* was reduced in 1885 to 6*d.*, and by this new scheme the British Post Office could claim to have inaugurated the cheapest service of its kind in the world. The Great War saw the disappearance of that most cheap and popular feature of fast Post Office service, and it was only in May 1935 that the sixpenny telegram was reborn, sending up telegram circulation by 34 per cent. The 'greetings telegram,' which was introduced at the same time, still further increased the popular appeal of the telegram. Nearly 25,000 messages were sent during the first week. The weekly average of 'greetings telegrams' is now over 60,000. Compared with the seven million of 1870, the total number of telegrams dispatched from this country to-day, which has reached 58,382,000, is rather impressive.

If the Post Office attitude towards the telegraph had been one of heavily moving officialdom, it was certainly quick to realise the opening up of unforeseen avenues with the coming of the telephone. The adoption of the telephone was recommended by Sir William Preece, then chief electrician of the Post Office, hardly a year after the first experiments had been made in this country. It was felt that the regulations provided by the Telegraph Act, which gave a virtual monopoly to the Post Office, would cover the telephone as well. But commercial enterprises soon showed that this belief was not shared

by them. Undaunted by eventual legal complications, they set up their lines all over the country. The Post Office authorities, fully aware of the danger to their monopoly if the telephone were to take away big business from the telegraph, tried to come to some reasonable arrangements. The struggle, which was carried on by both sides with determination and bitterness, ended up in the law courts with the historical decision that a 'telephone conversation was the equivalent of a telegraphic message.'

With this the Postmaster-General's monopoly was protected against any further contest and the telephone companies could but seek a compromise with the postal authorities. Happily for them the Treasury did not feel inclined towards a great expenditure on telephones, at least for the near future, and an agreement was reached that the companies should be allowed to continue their work under licence for the payment of a royalty of 10 per cent. to the Post Office. The licences were granted for a period of thirty-one years, leaving it open to the Postmaster-General to buy out any company in the 10th, 17th, or 24th year of the agreement.

Competition gradually forced the companies together, until in 1889 the National Telephone Company was formed as the result of previous amalgamations. But even so the service remained decentralised and unsatisfactory from the public's point of view, and the Post Office was forced to meet public pressure by announcing that no more licences were to be granted. However, it was not before 1912 that the whole of the telephone service was under Post Office control. Only figures can tell the tremendous story of the telephone from 1914 to 1939; the story of the telephone's wondrous journey from the palace of the rich down to the familiar red box which welcomes us with a reassuring glow in the remotest hamlet of the British Isles. In 1880 the first telephone directory appeared with 407 subscribers. In 1914 the total of telephone calls was 834,000,000. You could meet with any amount of people who had never put a telephone call through in their lives. The number of inland calls in 1938 amounted to 2,200,000,000. This represents an average of 48 calls per person on the basis of the population of the United Kingdom. Comparing the number of telephones per hundred inhabitants, however,

the United Kingdom comes only ninth in the list of nations.

Telephone and telegraph, the Castor and Pollux of Post Office service, have completed a circuit round the world, and the dividend in human happiness which they are paying out day by day should easily silence those who are bemoaning the 'good old times' of our grandparents. Even the wireless, though it has brought one more medium of education and recreation within the reach of even the poorest of the community, cannot be compared in its vital effects on human progress and development with either the telegraph or the telephone. Wireless made its appearance even before people had had a chance to settle down to the other great inventions of the day. Wireless history, in fact, goes back as far as 1895, when the first communication of that kind was established between Crookhaven post office and Fastnet lighthouse. It was founded on the plans of Willoughby Smith. In 1896 Marconi entered the field in Britain, to be heartily welcomed by Sir William Preece, who afforded him every possibility to carry out his experiments. Unfortunately for the Post Office the eager hounds of commerce were quickly on Marconi's traces. In 1897 a company acquired his patents, which meant a sudden end to Marconi's contact with the British Post Office. From now on they were rivals.

The speed at which the enormous possibilities of wireless unfolded was almost incredible. By 1904 definite legislation had become necessary to bring some kind of order into amateur activity, which flourished like mushrooms over night. The working of a wireless set was made dependent upon a licence from the Postmaster-General. In 1922 the number of these licences was 125,000. To-day the Post Office is responsible for the issue of 8,500,000 licences. There are 200 officers with 100 motor vans distributed throughout the country to deal with the numerous complaints of interference. The Post Office also controls 330 relay systems with some 250,000 subscribers, and has installed for the use of the B.B.C. a network of permanent circuits which account for about 10,000 miles of wire. Simultaneously with the legislation in connection with wireless licences an agreement was signed with the Marconi Company providing for the

delivery through the Post Office of any telegram handed to them by the Marconi Company. By 1907 the Post Office not only had erected four coastal stations, but had acquired those which had been previously controlled by the Marconi Company and Lloyd's.

The final phase in the struggle between the Marconi Company and the Post Office was reached when at last trans-Atlantic transmission had become a reality. The firm stand of the postal authorities during this stage of development was largely due to pressure from the Dominions, who maintained, with full justification, that Empire communications should be owned and worked by the Empire. Thus a compromise was reached with the Marconi Company which provided for state-owned Empire stations, leaving them a completely free hand as to the erection of stations in other countries. This agreement was but one of the many milestones on the road of Empire unity. The first of these postal milestones was planted as early as 1886, when Henniker Heaton moved a resolution in the House for the introduction of universal Empire penny postage.

Though the motion was defeated, agitation for Empire penny postage never ceased. The fight for imperial penny postage lasted no less than fourteen years, until Canada in 1889 decided to take matters in her own hands. Some time before a resolution had been passed at an imperial conference in favour of imperial penny postage. That was sufficient indication that all the Dominions would follow suit if one of them were to take the lead. Thus, while Britain was still considering the pros and cons of it, Canada under the Hon. William Mullock, Postmaster-General, boldly announced in 1889 that the charge of a letter to Great Britain was to be one penny from now on. As was expected, the rest of the Dominions followed suit, and thus by Mollock's bold initiative one more link was added to Empire unity.

On the whole, however, postal efficiency and postal development in the Dominions and Colonies somewhat lagged behind the mother country. This, of course, was not surprising in pioneer lands. In Natal, for instance, the primitive days of the post are still remembered by some old inhabitants. In the days of V. A. Schooneberg, the first postmaster of Durban, the mail was received

and collected in his house at any odd time. He was not paid a cent for his trouble. In 1881 the Postmaster-General of Natal had a salary of but 400*l.*, a year, while postmasters in the country received 12*l.* p.a. for their trouble. Since then an enormous stride has been made both by the Home and the Colonial posts. New branches have been grafted on to the old main stem.

But a hundred years ago the Post Office's only function was the carrying of letters. There was not even a parcel post, for this was only introduced to British postal services in 1883. Within a year the number of parcels delivered, then, had reached 14,000,000. To-day this number has increased to 179,540,000. A hundred years ago the sending of money through the channels of the Post Office was unheard of. To-day the value of the remittance services which the Post Office performs is 177,000,000*l.* or roughly 17*l.* per family. Nowhere is the enormous scope of our modern Post Office reflected more visibly than at the Accounts Headquarters in West Kensington. Their activities, apart from strictly postal business, cover a wide range of services performed for other Government departments, such as Inland Revenue stamps, the sale of national insurance, issue and repayment of Savings Certificates, payment of old age and war pensions, the issue of wireless and motor licences, etc.

No less than 24,500 post offices throughout the country are engaged in the performance of these services, and the cash passing through the Post Office accounts amounts to over 1,500,000,000*l.* p.a. The annual wage bill for the 228,000 Post Office servants has reached the respectable figure of 46,000,000*l.* The Post Office to-day is one of the largest employers of labour in the country and, one can almost assume, in the world. In the days of Rowland Hill the idea of a savings bank for the less well-to-do was merely confined to a few philanthropists. It was only in 1861 that the Post Office Savings Bank came into being, with 435 deposits amounting to 911*l.*, which were received on the opening day. To-day at Headquarters in West Kensington a staff of 4000 deals with 140,000 transactions every day, involving 740,000*l.*

Within the last twenty years the Post Office has grown another mighty arm to embrace the whole of the British

Empire: the British Air Mail! In justice to the first air-mail carriers one is bound to say that air mail is not just a thing of the last twenty years. It goes back as far as 1884, when a pigeon post was organised for the fruit steamers in the Fiji Islands. Next, the balloon was made to serve for the conveyance of the mail. During the Franco-Prussian War the balloon air mail was practically the only means of getting any mail out of Paris, which was besieged by the Prussian armies. The mail was sent up by balloon, the answers travelled back by pigeon post. Gambetta himself escaped with the mail from the beleaguered city in an effort to reorganise its defence from Tours.

The story of our modern air mail is too fresh in our own memories to be repeated here. But let us glance at the result of that tremendous history.

Since 1937, when the Empire Air-Mail scheme was introduced on the route to East and South Africa, it has been extended by stages to India, Malaya, and Australia. The main countries now embraced in the scheme include the Empire countries in East and South Africa, Egypt, Palestine, India, Ceylon, Malaya, Burma, Hong Kong, Australia, and New Zealand. How much nearer have these countries been brought to us by this last chapter of postal history? India, Ceylon, and South Africa are a week nearer to us; East Africa and Malaya about a fortnight; and the same is true of New Zealand and Australia. The rise in the number of letters dispatched by air went arm in arm with the general aeronautical development. Only half a million letters were carried by air in 1927; by 1935 the number had increased to ten million, and it had jumped to one hundred million by 1938. Perhaps at a time not far distant the Air Mail will handle every kind of postal traffic and we shall come to look upon ground traffic with the same mixture of wonder and amusement with which we now gaze on the mail coach in all its faded beauty.

OLGA ILLNER.

Art. 3.—SPAIN, ENGLAND, AND THE DUKE OF ALBA.

THE appointment of the Duke of Alba as Spanish Ambassador is causing satisfaction to all who wish well to both countries and who hope for the peace of the world. During the attempt, last September, of the disruptive forces to provoke a European war, there arose from many directions a chorus of outcries that General Franco was pledged to 'support Mussolini and Hitler' in whatever they might intend. The Duke of Alba then notified our Foreign Office that in the event of European war National Spain would preserve the same neutrality as under the Monarchy in 1914-18. But so short is the public memory that the fiction as to 'Franco's designs on Gibraltar' and 'subservience to Germany and Italy' reappears again and again in print. The Duke is said to have remarked, 'Even a wise man may be deceived once; but why do people allow themselves to be deceived times without number, and always from the same sources?'

Last year, when our Government was still not 'recognising' the ruler of 38 out of 50 provinces of Spain, Léon Daudet in 'L'Action Française' observed that Franco's genius was shown not only in the field of action but in his choice of the right man for each especial task. Monsieur Daudet instanced the wisdom of selecting as Agent to England the Duke of Alba—partly British by ancestry, educated in England, and so well known to his contemporaries here that his name was a guarantee for the integrity of the Nationalist cause. More than any other Spaniard—unless it was King Alfonso—the Duke of Alba had laboured in many parts of Europe to win increased affection for Spain. 'One of the chief objects of my life,' he said in London in 1930, 'has been to help England and Spain to understand and love each other better.' And a few months ago, when lurid stories of Franco's 'enmity to England' and the 'danger to us if he wins' were flying from mouth to mouth, the Duke remonstrated, 'Can anyone seriously suppose that if General Franco had hostile intentions towards Britain, he would send me to represent him?'

A chapter called 'The Fiction Factory' in Messrs Foss and Gerahty's book 'The Spanish Arena' should be commended to every reader; and it can be supplemented.

During 1937 several of our newspapers gave a dramatic description of a meeting at Genoa of the Duke of Alba with Mussolini, in which the Duke was depicted as 'begging' and imploring Italy not to abandon Spain. The abject and agitated language marked the story as imaginary; and some of us realised that not 'Genoa' but Geneva was the scene of his activities. He was then answering the Red Government delegate, and charging the usurpers of authority with the responsibility for the terrible massacres in Madrid. The accusation has the more poignancy in that his brother the Duke of Peñaranda, probably, and his cousin the Duke of Veragua, certainly, had been among the victims. In the darkest time of Spain's ordeal, in 1936, he said, 'I cannot believe that a country with so great a past can be destined to perish.' His power of resistance to all the losses and disasters he has suffered since 1931 has been founded upon his clear knowledge of history, and his conviction of past, present, and future being an organic whole. 'God, who sent us great men in time of need in the old days, may yet send us aid to-day,' he wrote from Spain in 1934 to a friend in England. The saying of a sixteenth-century soldier-scholar, that those who live only in the present are 'as mercenaries hired by the day,' but those whose thoughts travel across many centuries are already conscious of eternity, might well apply to him. As Director of the Royal Academy of History and as President of the Board of the Prado (National Gallery), he has often said that pride of race does not depend on rank or wealth but is the heritage of all who are capable of appreciating their country's best achievements in art and action. In our time, when an effort has been made to reduce history to a basis of mere 'economics,' the Duke has emphasised the heroic spirit by which the greatness of old came into being. To combine the lessons of the past with the best possibilities in the present, and so build for the future, was his mother's precept and example. And through his descent from two of the most famous Generals in Europe, and his childhood spent amidst relics of their careers in the Liria Palace, a delight in history came so naturally to him that it seems strange to him that other people can be lacking in this sense of continuity and of the permanence of the past.

James Charles Manuel FitzJames Stuart was born in Madrid on Oct. 17, 1878, eldest child of the ninth Duke of Berwick and sixteenth Duke of Alba. The union of these two titles had come about in the early nineteenth century, when the thirteenth Duchess of Alba, the heiress, who had married the Marquis of Villafranca, died childless. Her property and honours then passed to the descendants of her great-aunt, Maria Teresa Alvarez de Toledo y Silva, who had been wife of the third Duke of Berwick. Thus the Alba tapestries, pictures, armour, and MSS. came to Liria. The present Duke was twelve years old when his mother issued her first book, 'Documentos Escogidos del Archivo de la Casa de Alba.' One of the few survivors of her contemporaries, Don Manuel de Escandon y Barron, Marqués de Villavieja, in his delightful volume 'Life has been Good,' has depicted her in a few spontaneous pen-strokes :

'The enthusiasm she showed when she made new discoveries amongst hidden-away art treasures was touching. . . . She would often receive me in the midst of some very important work, carrying bundles of dusty papers under her arms, dumping them down on the floor, sorting them, dusting them, and carefully taking an inventory of them all. I remember one day going down to the cellars in the Liria with her to see her work. Endless rows of family papers, left in hopeless confusion after two big fires in the house, were spread on tables and on the floor. She stooped down, and almost caressing them, said, "I have been sent here to take care of all this ; coming generations will surely thank me."

'No sooner had she restored order in the family archives than she began her methodical work in the library. . . . Little by little everything of value in the Alba mansion passed through her hands and was put in its right place. . . . She took great pride in telling me about her latest improvements in the Liria, fully realising that the efforts she made would benefit the future Dukes of Alba. To bring her children up to understand the importance of her work and carry it on was one of her chief concerns,' and she relied upon her eldest son to 'continue the traditions of that great name which was so closely connected with Spanish history.'

Educated at Beaumont College, Windsor, 'the Catholic Eton,' the Duke of Huescar, as he then was, made many friends in England, while his devotion to Spain was

encouraged by his great-aunt, the Empress Eugénie (Condesa de Teba), then living at Farnborough. The Second Empire and her brilliant Court at the Tuileries had come to an end eight years before he was born ; but he was vividly interested in all that she could tell him. In 1920, when she died in Madrid in the Palace of Liria, part of her property came to him, including the Montijo and Teba MSS., of which he had published in 1915 a detailed catalogue with beautiful coloured facsimiles of some of the most princely treasures. Despite all the distractions and interruptions of the sad years after 1931, the Duke persevered in his project of publishing a selection of the letters she had written to her parents and himself and other near relations. Until this was accomplished, he thought posterity could not do full justice to a character which from early childhood to extreme old age showed the same noble and generous qualities : ardent yet reticent, affectionate and constant, but mentally astute. In his own words prefacing the volume (in French) :

' . . . The Spanish virtues which, though sometimes eclipsed by political passions, survive in the very soul of our race, shone steadily in her. Of a vigorous personality, clear intellect, and an education superior to that of the majority of her contemporaries, . . . an impulsive temperament drove her to make impetuous judgments, sometimes unjust, but nobly and spontaneously rectified.' She had ' a profound faith and sincere piety, without bigotry. . . . And, above all, she was characterised by two attributes which no misfortune could dim . . . loyalty and valour.' *

A man's character can be inferred from whom and what he admires ; and the Duke of Alba has often said that the two chief influences upon his youth were those of his mother and the Empress Eugénie. When in 1901 he succeeded to his twenty-four titles, chiefly mediæval—the most modern are Berwick, Liria, and Xérica—his mother was still comparatively young, and seemed to have many years of happiness ahead. But a fatal illness overtook her in the spring of 1904, just as she was about to arrange the letters of a Spanish Ambassador—' Correspondencia de Gutierre Gomez de Fuensalida, Embajador

* 'Lettres Familiales de l'Impératrice Eugénie conservées dans les Archives du Palais de Liria,' etc., Paris, 1935, vol. 1, p. ix.

en Alemania, Flandes y Inglaterra (1495-1509).' This task was completed in 1907 by her son, who explained in his dedication :

' . . . by the ever-present memory of my late Mother I am impelled to publish this book ; to make her subject mine, to let my pen follow her pen, to carry out the plans which were suddenly interrupted by her death. . . . The last of her projects was the publication of this volume, which she had undertaken as a surprise for her mother and brothers, in whose Archives the original papers were found. Unfortunately for all concerned, and for the book, it has fallen to me ' to attempt ' a work in which all that is good must be attributed exclusively to the intrinsic value of the documents and to the filial love which inspires me. . . . '

But actually the documents might not have been easy to understand had not the Duke added a biographical and critical introduction, in which he gently corrected sundry English mistakes, including the pronouncement in our Calendar of State Papers that Fuensalida's correspondence had not survived. It may be doubted whether many of the friends who went shooting with the Duke in France, England, Russia, and Moravia, or played polo with him in Spain, England, and France, had read his various books : for it was not his habit to speak of his historical work except to those already interested. One of his most characteristic *discursos*, published by the Royal Academy of History in 1919, was on the third Duke of Alba—the renowned Don Fernando Alvarez de Toledo who accompanied Philip of Spain to England in 1554 and was subsequently Governor of the Netherlands and Conqueror of Portugal. We may assume this biographical essay to have been written in the room at Liria in which were kept the armour of the 'Great Duke,' his camp writing-table, his portrait by Titian, and a bust of Philip II, arranged against a background of tapestries depicting his victories.

Of these last the Marqués de Villavieja wrote in 1938 :

' They were of Flemish workmanship, woven in gold and silk, and were real masterpieces. The colourings were amazingly soft—mellowed, of course, by time—and the multitude of tiny figures introduced in the design was in-

credible. Myriads of warriors, on foot and on horseback, . . . emerged from distant camps through the flat monotonous country of Flanders. Every detail was so exquisitely designed and carried out that the whole scene of the battle seemed to move towards one.' *

To survey all the activities of the Duke of Alba is not possible here; but we should recall his Wagner Society, 1911-15. When only Italian music was appreciated in Spain, he introduced Wagner by means of concerts; and after four years prevailed upon the Royal Opera to produce masterpieces erstwhile rejected. He then dissolved his Society as no longer necessary. It was he who, during those years, noticed that many of the oldest pictures in the Prado were being adversely affected by the climate. So he organised the Board of the Prado, of which he was appointed President; and thenceforth those brittle paintings on panel were no longer exposed to extremes of heat and cold, but kept at an even temperature all the year round.

In 1925 '*El Mariscal de Berwick*,' a beautifully illustrated biographical volume by the Duke, was printed in Madrid. It is the duty, he said in the preface, 'of those who inherit great names and titles won for notable services to see that the memory of these actions is not allowed to fade.' James FitzJames, son of King James II and of Arabella Churchill (sister of the future first Duke of Marlborough), had one of the most remarkable careers of his time. Distinguishing himself in early boyhood as a soldier abroad, he was still under twenty-one when the revolution which drove his father into exile compelled him either to accept Dutch William as his Sovereign or go abroad. As a Catholic, he chose the latter course—after the defeat of King James's forces in Ireland. In the wars of Louis XIV he rose steadily to well-earned honours. His greatest exploit was in Spain. A century afterwards, during the Peninsular War, it was remarked to Napoleon Bonaparte that the battle of Almansa in 1707 was one of the few in which the French had beaten the English. 'Yes,' said Napoleon, an assiduous reader of history, 'but the English were commanded by Ruvigny, Lord

* '*Life has been Good*,' p. 94. One of these battle tapestries is reproduced in collotype in Tenison's '*Elizabethan England*,' vol. v, 1936.

Galway, a Frenchman; and the French and Spanish forces by James Duke of Berwick, an Englishman.' (It is vain to speculate what would have happened if Berwick had been the legitimate son of King James; or even if he had been General for his half-brother 'the Old Pretender' in 1715 instead of the Earl of Mar, who flouted the advice of Dundee's former officers and of all the experienced soldiers, and so lost the battle of Sheriffmuir by insisting on his own unskilful methods.) It was after the battle of Almansa that Berwick was made a Grandee of Spain and created Duke of Liria and Xérica.

The destruction of the Liria Palace in 1936 by the 'Militia' (i.e. Reds) and by certain anarchists imported from Catalonia was the more wicked in that the Palace was a national monument, the treasures in which were accessible to almost any student for whose respectability and serious purposes there were adequate guarantees. In early 1930, when Primo de Rivera's government had fallen and General Berenguer formed a Cabinet, nobody foresaw that the Duke of Alba's entry into politics would be ironically requited, in less than seven years, by the ruin of his home. First nominated Minister for Public Instruction in January 1930, and then as Minister for Foreign Affairs—at a most difficult time when many subversive politicians and 'intellectuals,' pardoned but unrepentant, had returned to Spain—the Duke supposed that the lack of sympathy he noticed in the English press was due to insufficient knowledge. So in July that year at Londonderry House he invited the press to send representatives for a talk with him. And again in Madrid in December, after Galán's Red rising, he was as easily accessible.

An enormous sum of money being then discovered in the possession of an obscure student, and there being every indication that the revolutionary movement had been directed from outside Spain, the Cabinet—though not realising the full extent of the menace—worked out a tariff which should prevent Russian dumping. The Duke of Alba wrote of this to a friend in England; but at the same time as his letter arrived the news was telegraphed that the Berenguer Cabinet had resigned. The Duke's place as Foreign Minister was then filled by the Count of Romanones. That veteran politician informed the

press and the world that the new Constitution was to be so elastic as to allow liberty to all shades of opinion ; but he stated that the vast masses of the people were predominantly monarchical. He presumably did not know that in January there had been put on paper for the Fourth International, and circulated secretly in Europe and the United States, a project for the complete destruction of the Spanish Crown, Church, and aristocracy ; and then the wreck of the entire nation.

The manner in which the municipal elections of April 1931 were represented to King Alfonso as a sign that the country was against him, the astonishing way in which he—who had stood up to so many attempts to assassinate him—was persuaded to regard it as his duty to leave Spain 'to avert bloodshed' appeared incredible when the news first reached the Duke of Alba, who was away in France for the funeral of his uncle the Duke of Montellano. He met the King on arrival in Paris ; and the King requested him to continue his work at the Prado and the *Real Academia* ; and also gave him a message to take back to the Royalists in general, bidding them accept the Republic and try to make it a success. The first command was obeyed ; the second was impossible of fulfilment. Zamora, who imagined himself capable of doing better than his Sovereign—and who proclaimed that 'Communism is a myth in Spain'—was also (we may infer) not conversant with the Red schedule in Russian (and by that time also circulating in English), the tenor of which, denuded of its Marxian jargon, ran as follows :

(1) Work on the vanity of the King's enemies to contrive the downfall of the Crown and the creation of a Republic.

(2) Influence the Republic to destroy the Religious Orders and to penalise the aristocracy.

(3) When that Republic has reduced the country to a state of chaos and got rid of all the Royalist officers and replaced them by Marxians, pull down the Republic.

(4) Arm the 'proletariat' to exterminate the 'bourgeoisie.' Establish a Soviet under alien control.

(5) And having conquered Spain from within, do the same with Portugal. And whereas in Wellington's day the Peninsula had been the scene of defeat of the French Revolution forces, make Spain the base of operations for world revolution by the Militant Godless.

Not until King Alfonso arrived in London as an exile did he learn of the existence of this horrible conspiracy and see that whereas his departure had been represented to him by Zamora and Sanjurjo as the one way to prevent a civil war, it was actually the first act of the Soviet drama for obliteration in Spain of all that was Spanish.

The most detailed history of the lamentable years ensuing is 'The Spanish Arena,' by Messrs Foss and Gerahty, in a foreword to which the Duke of Alba wrote: '... the pacific entry of the Republic was not a first success of the new regime, but the last act of generosity of the old. Before the Republic was a month old, the ship of State had run on the rocks.' The disruptive plan of the Red International progressed stage by stage, according to the schedule. In October 1932 the Duke of Alba, with his brother and all other grandees, was gazetted to be deprived of his country estates; and a warrant was issued for his arrest soon afterwards, while he was away in France. The Liria Palace was then searched by Government police, who even looked under the tables and sofas. The Duke's old majordomo, who had been with him a quarter of a century or more, is said to have protested, 'If the master were here, it is not under the table you would find him, but standing up to you and telling you to go to the devil!'

With extraordinary daring, in spite of the warrant, the Duke obeyed a summons back to Madrid to 'answer questions' about Sanjurjo's rising, which had taken place when he was out of Spain. The Republic came to the conclusion that to persecute any further a Spaniard so well known throughout Europe, and so popular in Spain itself, would not at the moment be expedient. But other noblemen and officers were sent in a cattle-boat to Villa Cisneros, in the most squalid and insanitary conditions, such as malicious minds risen suddenly to power delight to inflict upon their moral superiors. They even sent as prisoners to Africa men who had been acquitted by their own courts of law. Strikes, arson, murders, and miseries multiplied in such sort that at the next election, November 1933 (at which the Duke of Alba presided twenty-four hours at a polling booth), there was a great reaction, and the Socialists, except in some of the cities, were defeated. Vanquished at the polls, they threatened violence the next

time, and the attempted Red revolution of 1934 in Asturias and Catalonia was marked by many atrocities—the destruction of the Cathedral and the University Library at Oviedo being among the exploits of those ‘champions of democracy.’ Precisely because the general conditions were so increasingly wretched, the patriotic among the Spaniards hoped the elections of 1936 would be a repetition of those of 1933. But the fourth stage of the Red International plan had been reached; extremes of violence and terrorism were organised by the Moscow-impelled Marxians. Even so, the Reds did not get sufficient votes; whereupon they cancelled the elections and came into government by force; whereon such a reign of terror began as was reminiscent of the French Revolution, upon which it had been modelled.

The Duke of Alba has long been in the habit of coming to England in July; and he was in London when Calvo Sotelo recited in the Cortes the unpunished crimes committed since the incoming of the ‘Popular Front.’ The Red female deputy, ‘La Pasionaria,’ shrieked out, ‘That man has spoken for the last time.’ The news that Sotelo had been murdered, not by the mob but by Government police, was telephoned to the Duke of Alba, who was then at Claridge’s. His brother, the Duke of Peñaranda, spoke to him from Madrid on the gravity of the situation. Arrested almost immediately afterwards, the Duke of Peñaranda is thought not to have survived for many weeks. Some say he died of illness in prison; others that he was murdered, like his cousin the Duke of Veragua, the head of the house of Columbus. The murder of Sotelo and the discovery of secret orders for an organised massacre of all the Catholics of all ranks and in every locality—the black lists even including babies in arms, if they were of noble or pious families—brought about the rising of General Franco to rally and redeem Spain. Meanwhile the Palace of Liria had been taken over by the so-called Government. A rumoured confiscation and distribution of the Alba treasures evoked from Sir Frederick Kenyon an admirable protest in a letter to ‘The Times.’ But, alas, it was in vain to appeal to the reason and justice of a Government which had opened the gaols and put arms in the hands of criminals, authorising them to rob, slay, and burn at their pleasure.

At first Liria was described as guarded by the Militia ; and they issued passes, stamped with the hammer and sickle, authorising themselves and others to use the tennis-courts of 'the ex-Duke of Alba.' It was not until mid-November that the final destruction took place ; and was announced in England on the wireless as being due to 'insurgent bombs.' Certain English Members of Parliament, with an intrusiveness almost incredible, tried to persuade the Duke of Alba to telegraph rebuking Franco for bombing an open town. But whatever 'hidden hand' may have hoped thus to embroil the Duke with the General, the Duke even under the first shock of the horrible news did not lose his presence of mind. He replied that not Franco but the Reds would have been responsible for the outrage, and suggested that these Members might telegraph instead to the Red Government protesting against the massacres in Madrid. Had Franco not been a student of the Peninsular War, with an inherited regard for Wellington and England, his patience might not have remained unruffled. But for preventing the breach which the world-revolution agents hoped to create we should also thank the Duke of Alba. His consent to come here as Franco's Agent-General was given while our press was often so preposterously uncivil to the Nationalists and so flattering to the oppressors that those of us old enough to remember our well-balanced and dignified press of early in the century were appalled by such a decline in the traditional British instinct of 'fair play.' Whether any other Spaniard than the Duke of Alba would have kept his temper in all the peculiar circumstances may be doubted. His affection for the England of his youth, his education here, his many friendships in this country, his own Scottish and English ancestry presumably combined to enable him to endure the anomalous position of 'Agent' for the General whom not only the gutter-press but even the leading newspapers continued to call a 'rebel' and 'insurgent'—terms they had been chary of applying to the Red Galán in 1930 or to the perpetrators of the atrocities at Oviedo in 1934.

Going backwards and forwards to Spain, visiting the fighting lines, writing to friends in England, 'This is a Crusade ; the old heroic Spain is re-born,' the Duke—whose property had been confiscated by the Republic,

whose capital had been looted from the Bank of Spain, whose ancestral treasures had been scattered, and whose home had been deliberately wrecked—preserved through all those griefs a resolute and declared ‘hope in God’ which was a rebuke to his country’s enemies and an example to Spain’s friends. That he, who despite all menace, losses, shocks, and disasters, has held his head high and refused to despair for his country, is now Ambassador for victorious Spain is entirely appropriate.

That the times ahead will be difficult, that leisure and repose may be far distant, that there will remain much to be done for the healing of wounds and the restoration of harmony goes without saying. It behoves each one of us to aid in circulating the truth, endeavouring thus to rebuild between Britain and Spain the sympathy which should never have been impaired. ‘Truth,’ wrote the Duke of Alba in 1919, ‘is the firmest support of thrones, and the best guide for the ruling of nations.’ And now, twenty years later, after the fiery ordeal both national and personal, he stands before the world more than ever determined to overcome evil with good ; and to continue, *Dei gratia*, his life’s work of ‘helping England and Spain to understand and love each other better.’

MICHAEL BARRINGTON.

Art. 4.—DELINQUENCY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

1. *Motives and Mechanisms of the Mind.* By Dr E. Graham Howe. *The Lancet*, 1931.
2. *The Criminal, the Judge, and the Public.* By Dr Franz Alexander and Hugo Staub. Allen and Unwin, 1931.
3. *Individual Psychology.* By Dr Erwin Wexberg. Allen and Unwin, 1930.
4. *Understanding Human Nature.* By Dr Alfred Adler. Allen and Unwin, 1928.
5. *The Psychological Treatment of Crime.* By Dr W. Norwood East and W. H. de B. Hubert. H.M. Stationery Office, 1939.

AMONG the great scientific discoveries of the last half century which, if properly used, can be of inestimable service to mankind must be included those of Modern Psychology. This branch of science affects human knowledge and activity in many spheres, and obviously the administration of the criminal law must be deeply concerned. Indeed, the results in criminal courts and penal institutions must be revolutionary when it becomes finally accepted that human personality is influenced by unconscious as well as by conscious forces, and that experiences that have passed out of conscious memory can still exercise a powerful and sometimes a motivating influence on human conduct. Such doctrines, when generally accepted, must affect deeply our conceptions of individual self-responsibility and our belief in both the justice and the efficacy of punishment.

There are some to-day who believe that these discoveries of Modern Psychology completely rob our present methods of trial and punishment of all justification, and that nearly all who have committed any serious breach of the criminal law should pass into the hands of psychotherapists and thus be cured. Those who read Dr Grace Pailthorpe's book 'What We Put in Prison' will see this point of view sympathetically put. On the other hand, there are those who cannot see that our present legal and penal methods are in any way affected by Modern Psychology. Happily both extreme opinions are gradually diminishing. Psycho-therapists by closer contacts with delinquency have adopted a more modest and

practical attitude, and on the other side some on the Bench and in the legal profession are coming to realise that psychology can assist us and that some of our time-honoured assumptions are not of such universal application as we used to think. This gradual drawing together of psycho-therapists and lawyers is likely to increase as the result of the four years of experimental work in prisons, etc., which is described in the recently issued East-Hubert report. It is not my intention to write of the extent to which psychological principles affect or invalidate our present legal conceptions, but, accepting generally as I do these principles, to discuss to what extent they can be applied within our existing administration of the criminal and penal law.

Legal procedure and psychology cannot, I fear, fully earn each other's respect. Keen as I have long been upon enlisting the services of psychology in my work as a magistrate, I confess that I have no hopes of being able to behave as a magistrate in such a way as to earn the complete approval of psychologists. In the first place, let us face the fact that our historic methods of trial must inevitably offend the principles of psychology. If a psychologist were entrusted with the task of ascertaining whether a man has stolen a diamond necklace or has indecently assaulted a young girl, his methods would be completely different from those adopted to-day by police, prosecution, and courts. From the purely psychological standpoint could there be a worse method than: (1) telling the suspect, as soon as the matter is mentioned to him, that he need make no statement, with the obvious innuendo that it may be the worse for him if he talks; (2) accepting as a general principle that contradictory statements are evidence of deliberate lying, thus ignoring the inherently contradictory nature of human personality; (3) ascertaining the facts by means of a sort of sporting contest in which both sides admit in effect that a wrong decision of 'Not Guilty' does not matter; (4) doing so in a court-room whose very construction is so different from the normal surroundings of most present that fear is instilled in varying degrees; (5) doing so in the presence of public and press, the latter free to publish, except as regards children, the names and addresses? Yet these principles are fundamental in our present system of criminal prosecution and

trial, and I can see no sign that any of them is likely to be abandoned. Reformer as I am, I would not abandon them, for I am not convinced that psychologists can suggest any form of trial to put in their place which would command public respect. Has psychology any remedy against persistent lying where the circumstances create every inducement to lie? The criminal courts can ascertain facts, if necessary, without the co-operation of the person concerned. Can psychology claim to do this? Our present system has to be based on the assumption that a large proportion of people will not tell the truth where it is in their interest to lie or be silent. I freely admit that our present criminal methods, based on punishment, often act as an inducement to a plea of 'Not Guilty' and a denial of the truth, for there is always a chance of the case not being proved and the fear of prison is great. I often wish that it were possible for me, especially in sexual cases, to assure the accused before trial that if he wishes he can safely plead 'Guilty,' and thus avoid the distress to his victim that a trial involves; I would like to assure him that I want to cure and not punish him. But I cannot do this, for I have no certainty that he is guilty until I hear the evidence and I do not know his record till after the trial and thus cannot know whether he is a suitable case for treatment.

Psychologists have scarcely tackled the problem of criminal procedure in court. I do not deny that better methods are possible. I wish that psychologists would contemplate critically our forms of trial and give us lawyers the benefit of their advice. So far, psychology has only concerned itself with criminal procedure after guilt has been admitted or found, and here already a little progress has been achieved. Before contemplating existing conditions it is well to face honestly the fact that no complete agreement between the theories of the Freudian school of psychology and practical lawyers is likely. A lawyer has to accept free will as a reality, even if he realises that it is not universal; he has to accept punishment as one method of dealing with delinquents. The Freudian is not likely to accept either. If we are to progress by evolution, psychologists must not only be patient, but must accept methods and practical ideas of which they cannot approve. But even the extreme Freudian will

admit that we lawyers have made some progress. Leslie Stephen, in his biography of Fitzjames Stephen, says that the judge thought it quite right that the criminal law should assume that 'it is right to hate criminals' and that the judge regarded this hatred as a 'healthy, natural feeling' (p. 423). Fitzjames Stephen himself wrote in his 'History of the Criminal Law' (vol. II, p. 82): 'I think it highly desirable that criminals should be hated, that the punishments inflicted upon them should be so contrived as to give expression to that hatred.' This is still very largely the attitude both of criminal law and of public opinion. But happily the Probation of Offenders Act, 1907, provided that every criminal court could have regard to the character, antecedents, age, health, or mental condition of the person charged, or to the extenuating circumstances, and avoid inflicting any punishment at all. This principle is still law and, let us hope, will be eternal. Nearly all offenders can be placed under supervision with conditions, one of which may be submission to psychological treatment. While it has been comparatively rare that probation has been used to bring about psychological treatment, the fact that this has long been legally possible is a cause for rejoicing. Under the reform scheme of 1938-39 this power is made more explicit and safeguards introduced.

Most courts are now willing to listen attentively if reasonable psychological information is presented to them. Probation officers are becoming more abundant and some are becoming psychologically minded. The Institute for the Scientific Treatment of Delinquency is slowly growing and is receiving the support of some lawyers of eminence. This is all progress. But the first big step forward must be that there shall be in all courts an interval of at least a week between verdict and sentence, so that social and, if necessary, psychological enquiries may be made before any final decision is taken. We are far from this at present, as only in the big towns are our criminal courts so arranged that a remand after verdict for a week or more is practicable. At most assize courts, courts of quarter sessions, and magistrates' courts sentence follows verdict almost at once, either because the court sits for a day or two only or because the next court will be differently constituted. Where sentence quickly follows on verdict

or plea of guilty obviously there can be little real assistance from psychology.

I have sent innumerable delinquents to psycho-therapists and in plenty of cases have found the results of treatment satisfactory. But without any desire to belittle the importance of psychological examination and treatment, I must briefly draw attention to certain factors which restrict the practical possibilities. If the truths of psychology establish themselves in public opinion, eventually there must be a wholesale revision of our methods for both ascertaining the facts and dealing with offenders. But that time is not in sight. At present there is insufficient agreement about fundamentals between the various schools of psychology and we must not forget that our traditional methods, evolved during the centuries of history long before the relevance of psychology was thought of, have sunk deep in the legal and the popular mind. One could say of our present methods of trial and punishment what a moderate Labour Member of Parliament said to a Communist at a ceremonial opening of Parliament: 'This will take a lot of abolishing.'

(1) However psychologically minded anyone on the Bench may be, he cannot to-day expect to act in every case on psychological principles. The fact has to be faced that to-day there are crimes which cannot be dealt with solely, or even mainly, from the viewpoint of what is best for the delinquent. We must remember that psychologists are concerned with an individual, but that the Bench is concerned also, and indeed mainly, with society. One day, perhaps, murderers will be placed on probation and sent to a clinic for treatment. (Some murderers would not even need that, as the urge was only to kill one person.) But if we agree that this day is far off, we must rule out psychological considerations in plenty of other cases as well. For the fraudulent financier, the fire-raiser, the postman or railway servant who steals at work, the policeman who accepts bribes, the motorist who kills or maims when under the influence of alcohol, and so on, as well as for the murderer, there must be the probability of severe punishment in order to discourage others from similar conduct. Some of those who commit these offences will possibly need psycho-therapy, but such treatment may well have to be given in a place of

compulsory detention. One day, we may hope, the need for deterrent punishment will not exist, but I cannot see how we can rule out the need for it to-day, however greatly this has been abused in the past. Lombroso in his 'Crime, its Causes and Remedies' asked the question 'What sort of justice is that which punishes a man less for the crime he has committed than to serve as an example to others?' (p. 383), but I fear that the answer is that this sort of justice is to some extent inevitable in a world which is far from being psychologically minded.

(2) Courts have very limited scope. They have an individual before them, but that individual may well be the product of his heredity and his environment. For a long time I have been saying that the study of a criminal should begin nine months before he was born. Therapy both from the physical and the psychological standpoints is, in my opinion, only too often powerless if the sound Christian doctrine has been ignored that 'the first blessing of marriage is offspring, and this imposes upon parents the obligation of providing for their children. . . . In a genuine case of inability to maintain a large family, limitation of children is a duty.'* There can be no doubt that among the fundamental causes of delinquency (a) illegitimacy and (b) reckless breeding by parents unable to provide for their children are prominent.

The schools of psychology differ greatly on this subject. In his excellent exposition of the neo-Freudian view, Dr Graham Howe says frankly: 'Analysis cannot change fundamentals or make silk purses out of sows' ears. It can only make the best use of the potentialities of each individual's innate endowment, and with that limitation it must be satisfied' (p. 80). Dr Adler's school of Individual Psychology is more optimistic. Adler himself wrote: 'The concept that character and personality are inherited from one's parents is universally harmful' (p. 23). He denied 'the theories of the inheritance of especial traits or talents' (p. 156), and asserted that 'so far as psychic phenomena and character traits are concerned, heredity plays a relatively unimportant rôle' (p. 163). I confess myself unable to be so optimistic. In

* 'Moral Theology, Based on St. Thomas Aquinas and the Best Modern Authorities,' by two Dominican Fathers, John A. McHugh and Charles J. Callan, s. 2613 and 2621 (b).

children whom I know well I can see characteristics of many kinds that remind me, not only of the parents (that might be identification), but of grandparents, uncles, and aunts whom they have never or rarely seen. Even if character traits are not inherited, what of the inheritance of physical gland characteristics which, developing science slowly teaches us, have such a great influence upon our character? In the same book Dr Adler claimed that 'we find no solid medical foundation for an endocrine basis of character such as the endocrinologists claim' (p. 187), but endocrinology is a very young science, as Adler himself said at page 183. A mere lawyer is out of his depth here. I raise the subject merely as a warning that psycho-therapy may struggle in vain against nature, especially in cases coming from criminal courts. This, to my mind, is one of the reasons for the recording of so many failures in the East-Hubert report.

For the layman the teaching of Dr Adler is most easily found in Dr Erwin Wexberg's book. There the author goes so far as to say :

'Very little love is lavished on the children of large poor families. Every new child means greater poverty, and each new child is greeted with hate and considered the punishment for foolish indulgence. The child never learns the meaning of love. . . . It is obvious that in many poor families where a child grows up without love the social feeling dies of starvation' (p. 161).

I would not go so far as that, for I know that amid poverty even a large family can be a centre of love. But where the parents are automatic breeding machines, they sometimes produce children who are physically, mentally, or psychologically inadequate beyond repair long before school age. The American criminologist Albert Morris in his book 'Criminology' says :

'Birth itself is frequently an injustice. All too often children are born to parents who for reasons of health or economics do not want or should not have them. . . . In all of these cases the circumstance that is likely to lead towards delinquency and crime is not the poverty or lack of care, although these may enter, but the child's own feeling that he is not wanted and does not rightfully belong in the family circle' (p. 172).

If this is so, we have to face the awkward fact that, according to Adler himself, 'the psychic life does not change its foundation; the individual retains the same line of activity both in childhood and in maturity' (p. 7), and 'people do not change their attitude toward life after their infancy, though its expressions in later life are quite different from those of their earliest days' (p. 81). What greater arguments could there be for voluntary and deliberate parenthood? Our social services do little to prevent, but unconsciously encourage reckless breeding. Hence a vein of pessimism in me as regards the widespread possibility of ameliorative and psycho-therapeutic cures. Referring to the feeble-minded, Dr Wexberg says: 'We cannot deny that intelligence requires an intact apparatus. Where the necessary material is lacking, the personality loses its value, because there is no possibility of a compensatory function' (p. 142). My experience is that no 'compensatory function' is possible in many cases not certifiable as feeble-minded. Dr Wexberg also writes: 'The extreme practical significance of the point of view of individual psychology with regard to talent arises from the fact that no case is considered lost. Even seemingly hopeless cases are approached with the same pedagogic care and patience' (p. 144). Also: 'We assume a working hypothesis in education which may sound paradoxical: everyone can do anything he wants. . . . We treat every child as if it were true' (p. 145). Again I admire the optimism, but experience forces me to doubt.

I have had case after case where every modern method of straightening crooked humanity has been tried and yet the individual before me appears inevitably criminal. The causes may well be both defective eugenic origin and a serious deficiency of love in the earliest days. In such cases psycho-therapy seems almost hopeless. Dr J. R. Rees in his 'The Health of the Mind' writes of 'a background of normal intelligence' as being a condition precedent to successful therapy, and unfortunately the criminal courts have to deal with plenty of those who lack this background. The East-Hubert report gives a depressingly large number of cases where remedial treatment was found to be impossible because of inherent defects in the personality,—'constitutional psychic inferiority,' as the

authors describe the condition. 'Studies in genetics,' they write, 'have shown that heredity is of considerable importance' (para. 67).

One minor matter must be referred to here. It has to be realised that criminal courts can do but little to alter the environment which may have caused the defective psychological condition and in which the delinquent must continue to live. In reports that I have received from psychologists about cases before me I so often find the suggestion that suitable work should be found for the patient, and I realise the value of such work. Court probation officers do their best in this direction; but until society is ready to abandon all theories of free will, we cannot admit that the commission of crime is a sure way to an attractive job. Much work of all kinds (even much magisterial work) is boring and unattractive, but most of us have no alternative.

(3) Public opinion, and especially the aggrieved persons, often expect severe punishment of the offender. They are apt to be angry if an offender is dealt with by methods that are best from the standpoint of preventing further offences. This is particularly so in connection with sexual cases. A woman who has been insulted by an exhibitionist or the parents of a child indecently assaulted are not easy to deal with. They are satisfied with the prolonged imprisonment of the offender, and never think of the danger to the public that he may be when he comes out of prison. They are apt to resent the continued liberty of the offender even if arrangements are made for him to receive psychological treatment. I have often found it very difficult, and sometimes impossible, to convince aggrieved persons, especially aggrieved parents, that the best course for everybody is that the offender should be rendered harmless in future by treatment and that prison may easily make him a greater danger than ever. Alexander and Staub write that 'the principle of expiation which underlies every punishment acts chiefly not against the offender, but against our own forbidden impulses' and that a 'failure to punish an offender means to us a threat to our own repressive trends' (pp. 218, 213). Even if this is so, namely that people demand punishment because they know that they have it in themselves to commit such crimes, this consideration only increases the difficulty of a

court, since a court has no power over aggrieved persons, their relatives, or the general public.

(4) All schools of psychology are agreed that for treatment to be beneficial the co-operation of the patient is necessary. This means that, while formal confession is not necessary, to himself at least the offender must admit his offence and desire to be cured. Yet a large proportion of people steadfastly refuse to admit their offence, even to themselves, and even when they are assured that punishment is not to be expected. Their protestation of innocence gives them satisfaction and enables them to look their families in the face, and possibly obtain sympathy from them. They may, and sometimes do, refuse to see a psychologist or co-operate in any way. But they have no desire to appeal against their conviction. Again, many offenders have no desire to abstain from the gratification obtained by them from their form of crime. Case XLIV in the East-Hubert report ends thus :

' Although in many ways suitable for treatment, its application was quite impossible as both his perversion and his other weaknesses were justified by him intellectually and any attempt to change his attitude was regarded by him as an attempt to undermine his stability and, therefore, as something extremely dangerous.'

With such offenders, and they are not rare, courts can do nothing constructive. Yet they are often the very cases that most need psychological treatment. In this connection the ethical question arises whether the State has any right to probe into the unconscious of anyone without his full consent. Personally I would answer that question under present circumstances in the negative.

In contrast with these last are those who really enjoy the rôle of patient. Those who do not genuinely wish to get well are the despair of doctors in all branches of medicine ; but they are particularly hopeless in psychology. There are many who like to be dependent on public institutions and who dread having to stand on their own feet. In my court a man once excused himself from all his matrimonial deficiencies by telling me that he had an ' anxiety neurosis.' I later heard that he had had treatment at a hospital for psychological ailments ; he must have picked up his medical label by chance.

I felt that I could do nothing to fan any desire to be independent and useful that may once have existed. We should take warning of the lines by Corneille in 'Le Cid':

' Ah ! qu'avec peu d'effet on entend la raison
Quand le cœur est atteint d'un si charmant poison
Et lorsque le malade aime sa maladie,
Qu'il a peine à souffrir que l'on y remédie.'

(5) A serious practical impediment in the way of frequent use by courts of psycho-therapy is that many offenders, if psychology is to be of lasting benefit, need prolonged treatment. This depends, of course, on the school of thought in psychology to which the practitioner belongs. I can see no prospect of relief on Freudian lines for ordinary offenders. Dr Graham Howe says that 'for most of us an hour a day for three years as a therapeutic method is out of the question' (p. 250); yet some psychologists say that nothing else is of lasting effect. Dr Howe is, however, reasonable, and says frankly:

'There are many cases in which the therapeutic method must inevitably be limited, to a greater or lesser extent, to some kind of persuasion. This method is particularly suitable where time is limited or the patient has not sufficient intelligence to undergo the analytic or interpretive methods' (p. 239).

No mere lawyer can say whether a short treatment on these lines is scientifically sound, but he can say that in most cases it is all that is practicable. If it does not result in cure, at least it may result in a cessation of the offence. When one realises, as busy magistrates must, that most of the people who come before us, whether for crime or at the instigation of their wives, have never in their lives had the natural working of sex explained to them in a decent and clean way, one feels that, even if a short treatment is not scientifically the best, it must be of great assistance. The East-Hubert report cites many cases where, though cure was not achieved, any repetition of the offence seemed unlikely after the treatment.

Plenty of cases needing psychological treatment are unemployed—that fact may even have been the last straw that broke the offending camel's back—and how to obtain the necessary treatment for such men over any prolonged period is a problem that I have never solved. Again,

psychological treatment is usually available, if at all, far away from the homes of our people who need it. This difficulty is even great in London ; it is difficult to induce people to go frequently to the West End when they live at Battersea or Wandsworth.

One other practical difficulty has to be faced. To be truly scientific a medico-therapist wants social information, a physical test, an intelligence test, etc., before he begins to work. I have known men, who were with great difficulty persuaded to undergo treatment, lose their patience before they began their psychological treatment. These practical problems constitute another form of 'resistance,' but one with which magistrates have to wrestle even more than psychologists. When one reads in paragraph 34 of the East-Hubert report of the lengthy preliminary procedure before treatment was begun, one cannot help wondering whether thereby treatment was not rendered more difficult.

For these and other reasons I am convinced that psycho-therapy will make but slow progress among delinquents. Having set out the practical difficulties as I see them, I declare my faith that one day psychology will revolutionise our criminal law and procedure. But progress in the courts cannot go ahead of progress in social life ; on the contrary our courts are likely in the future, as they have always in the past, to lag behind public opinion. When we consider how inhibited we still are, how ignorant of any sound philosophy of sex, how our community has drifted from the inhibitions and unrealities and from the rigid religious ideas of the last century to a restless pursuit of happiness (which defeats its own objects and thus creates fresh psychological problems), and how many of these factors are most dominant in the people who figure in our criminal courts, then we must be content to hasten slowly. Practical psychologists realise this. Dr Wexberg was voicing the opinions of all schools when he wrote :

'We must not overlook the fact that the prevention and cure of criminality and of sexual delinquency, as well as the prevention of the craving for intoxicants and narcotics, will not be effected by individual therapy alone. The social and economic pressure which causes these manifestations must also become the object of our attention' (p. 169).

There is need for immediate further advance on psychological principles in the adult courts, but progress will be more rapid in the juvenile courts. Child guidance clinics are increasing in number, though unfortunately they are not well supported by the charitable public, and more and more juvenile courts will realise that a large proportion of their cases are in fact psychological problems. They will tend to realise this more easily when they have lost the power to use the birch.

As one who believes fundamentally in the main principles of modern psychology, I do not despair that progress is so slow. We can take courage from an idea which I borrow from Alexander and Staub's book :

' Not so many centuries ago, hysteria still belonged to a domain other than medicine ; it was a phenomenon on which only the law courts were supposed to be competent to pass judgment. The woman suffering from hysteria was called a witch and she was punished as such. It is not improbable that our treatment of the criminal will undergo a similar change in the future ' (p. XIII).

Though I am a lawyer, I fully agree with this Erewhonian prophecy. I see no need for despair in the fact that up to now cures in court cases have not on the whole shown particularly encouraging results. To some extent the depressing nature of the East-Hubert report may be discounted by the fact that the treatment was given in ordinary penal institutions, constructed and arranged for punishment rather than for cure. It has also to be taken into account that Dr Hubert's patients were undergoing sentences fixed without any regard to the possibilities of psycho-therapeutic cure. The report states several times that the sentence was either too long or too short to make treatment satisfactory. Yet when all such considerations have been weighed, the fact remains that the report is on the whole a discouraging document.

These considerations lead to a final, and for me a somewhat delicate, factor. The progress of psychology as a method for dealing with delinquents must be seriously hampered so long as the Bench is not itself psychologically minded, for otherwise the selection of cases and the sentence given will probably be unwise. It would be highly dangerous for the Bench to assume the functions

of the psycho-therapist, but some knowledge of what psychology teaches and what can be done by psycho-therapy seems desirable in all who have to decide the fate of delinquents. At present, whether the sentence be by judge, recorder, or stipendiary magistrate—all lawyers—or by lay justices, it is a matter of chance whether it is imposed by someone of psychological understanding. The day will come, though I do not expect to see it, when our law will demand that everybody upon whom rests the responsibility of deciding the fate of delinquents shall have had a definite training in psychology. Already, and it is all to the good, the Tavistock Clinic (Malet Place, W.C.1) holds lectures for magistrates on the psychology of delinquency, but they are not well attended. Perhaps one day attendance at such lectures will be a condition precedent to appointment to the criminal Bench, high or low, professional or amateur.

In the meantime we must plod along in the traditional English way. Obviously progress has to be slow, but to admit this is in no way to deny the present value or relevance of psychological knowledge or the ultimate goal of treatment for most serious breaches of the criminal law. I am convinced that on the psychological road we must inevitably proceed, but psychology as a means of dealing with delinquency can only make extensive progress on a level with progress in eugenic reform. As Dr Inge once said, the protection of life is not compatible with free trade in its production.

CLAUD MULLINS.

Art. 5.—THE GREAT CHRONICLE OF LONDON.

The Great Chronicle of London. Edited by A. H. Thomas, LL.D., of the Guildhall Records Office, and I. D. Thornley. Printed by George W. Jones at The Sign of the Dolphin. London. 1938.

THE Viscount Wakefield of Hythe has often impressed the minds of his contemporaries through his munificence, not only in helping innumerable good causes which had shown their need for practical support, but also in touching the imagination through the character of his gifts. In such ways he has done striking things; but surely nothing hitherto in its inspiration has been more romantic than the purchase and presentation to the City of London—of which he is an alderman and has been a sheriff and the Lord Mayor—of the original manuscript of what a leading expert, the late C. L. Kingsford, described as the fullest and most valuable copy of the London Chronicles extant. This detailed record of nearly three and a half centuries of mediæval history, with London at the core of it throughout, that was used by Stow in his 'Survey' and by many other chroniclers since, is now deposited in the Guildhall Library, after five hundred copies had been printed and bound at Lord Wakefield's charges for presentation to that number of highly fortunate institutions or persons.

As a joint production of the printers, binders, and makers of the collotype-facsimiles concerned in it, this volume is a delight to heart and eye. To borrow once more a hackneyed but serviceable phrase, it is evident that no pains have been spared to make the work attractive and worthy of the event; while as important as the efforts of the craftsmen engaged in it have been those of the joint-editors, Dr A. H. Thomas, of the Guildhall Records Office, and Miss Thornley. Their efforts and industry have been close, patient, and abundant. They have consulted the helpful authorities and made comparisons of all kinds with preceding chronicles. They have listed the earlier owners of the manuscript, who included, beside John Stow, Foxe, the compiler of that 'Book of Martyrs' which did not tend to the softening or sweetening of true religion and virtue; and have described

with a proper loving care the character and appearance of the script in its two well-defined portions. They have examined and particularised the handwritings of the inscribers of the Chronicle as well as of those, again to include John Stow, who added to it marginal notes, additions, and corrections, distinguished in the printed version by small and special types.

As to the identity of the narrator, the conclusion appears to be that he was one Robert Fabian, a sheriff and alderman of the City of London, who after some financial difficulties died prosperously and honoured by the Corporation. The work has decidedly the personal touches which add to its colour and interest; and, as the editors point out, the author, whoever he might have been, in its later part has blended with his narrative facts and details which he must have received from older men who had witnessed the events described; while from the early years of the reign of Edward IV onwards his story is coloured by his own aged memories of his reactions to the public events of his youth. Fabian died in 1513, about twelve months after the last year dealt with in the Great Chronicle. As a whole, this striking work deals with an extraordinary period in English history: the moving, picturesque, brutal, and brilliant Middle Ages. It begins with Richard Cœur de Lion and his 'great slaying' of Jews by day and by night, and concludes with the third year of Henry VIII, in whom the spirit of mediæval romance in its painted glory was to decay to materialism and wanton cruelty. Pre-eminently this is the Book of the City of London. Written by a citizen for citizens, it shows that the true heart of England, ever beating in confidence and warm with honourable home-pride, was that 'one square mile.'

At the beginning of the Great Chronicle, as recorded in 1189, the ruling chiefs of the City were two bailiffs who held annual and equal office together until 1209, when the first mayor, Henry FitzAlwyn, was elected and given the support of two sheriffs. FitzAlwyn was destined to hold office for five years, when he was succeeded by his son Roger, who, however, within twelve months was displaced by the barons, then in active opposition to King John. It is interesting, as showing the varied interest of events, to note that in

those years of the FitzAlwyns the building of St Mary Overy was begun ; London Bridge was constructed and destroyed by fire with the most part of London ; an Ambigensian was burnt for heresy ; and the Order of Friars Minor was here established. Such events, casually noted, which nowadays would be blazed on hoardings and in headlines, show that the Londoners of seven hundred years ago had their full supply of sensational events over which to wag beards in gossip. Beyond all else, from first to last, these records show how high were the reputation and importance of London and its Corporation, headed by the Mayor with his following of aldermen and councillors. At coronation-banquets he sat at a table near that of the King ; while in the troubles which frequently beset the realm in those long-drawn turbulent times the rulers of the City were consulted and their favours eagerly sought by monarchs, princes, and barons. They helped to fill the royal coffers as well, often, as those of the King's enemies ; in fact, they comprised a very influential and active institution whose favours were worth having and already were famous for their hospitalities and feasting, while jealous to maintain their corporate rights and privileges.

At the same time the official City was backed and troubled by the Trade Guilds, that, soon after they had been established for the encouragement and protection of their respective members and callings, grew so wealthy, proud, and self-assertive—as when, to the annoyance of the other companies, the tailors insisted on calling themselves Merchant Taylors—that it was necessary to make them suffer rebukes and penalties. Of which an instance is shown at the time of the marriage, that is brilliantly described, of Katharine of Aragon to Arthur, the firstborn of Henry VII. On her arrival from Spain, the princess was conveyed by water from Paul's Wharf to Westminster Bridge, accompanied by 'the Mayor and Aldermen with most worshipful fellowships of the City in barges garnished with banners and other cognizances of their crafts and all instruments of music.' But the barge of the Fellowship of Mercers happened not to be 'garnished and apparelled according to their worship,' whereupon they were called before the Mayor and aldermen to explain the neglect and were fined ten pounds.

And not only the chiefs and great ones of the City were proud of their London, for it was a vital, at times even a noisy, part of the patriotism of every decent citizen who lived, laboured, and prospered within its walls. In illustration of that statement we cannot do better than quote two stanzas of a ballad—the spelling modernised, which slightly spoils the rhythm—written by a Scottish priest who sat at a side-table when in Christmas week the Mayor, Sir John Shaw, gave a banquet to the Lord Chancellor and certain ambassadors from Scotland :

‘London, thou art of Towns “a per se,”
Sovereign of Cities, seemliest in sight,
Of high renown, riches, and royalty,
Of lords, barons, and many a goodly knight ;
Of most delectable lusty ladies bright,
Of famous prelates in habits clerical,
Of merchants full of substance and might ;
London, thou art the Flower of Cities all . . .

‘Above all Rivers, thy River hath renown,
Whose boreal streams pleasant and preclair
Under thy lusty walls runneth down
Where many a swan doth swim, with wings fair,
Where many a barge doth sail and row with oar,
Where many a ship doth rest with top-royal :
O Town of towns, patron and noncompare—
London, thou art the Flower of Cities all.’

It was a pretty compliment to the host and more pleasantly expressed than are most post-prandial orations.

With that ‘Flower of Cities all’ generally at the centre of its interest, the Great Chronicle out-rolls as in a warmly glowing coloured stream the pageantry of the Middle Ages ; but, alas, always it is with a dark accompaniment and background of treacheries, barbarities, and tyrannies uncompromising, in scope far-reaching and in their details horrible. Yet in Church and State the organisers of those ceremonies and processions, of marriages, coronations, trials, depositions, and executions were most efficient and able to dazzle the eyes of the multitude with the gorgeousness displayed. They made history with eagerness and an air.

The Law then, in its elaborate formalities and circum-

locutions, was as determined and particular to the last split hair as it was in the drab and smoky days of Charles Dickens—as, indeed, could only be expected when the leading churchmen were the chief law-makers and, as it suited their purposes, were the worst of the armed law-breakers as well. The deposition of Richard II, of which Shakespeare made rich dramatic use, provides an illustration of state ceremony in those wild and merciless feudal days. We have the whole story of it here, from the gradual ‘articles and causes reasonable’ for the deposing of the King and the renouncing of his authority and majesty. ‘And himself freely and gladly, as it seemed, and with glad cheer holding the scroll in his hand, said he would read it himself, and distinctly and “tretely” he read it over.’ There again in the case of that poor over-borne monarch was a grievous humiliation suffered ‘with an air.’ With all the harsh ferocity of the times they were good actors then and played their parts according to the rules, generally confronting their fate with dignity. This seems to have been true of all, from the proudest of ambitious noblemen to the poor hedge thieves and obstinate heretics, of whom there were many. Henry of Bolingbroke, the supplanter of Richard, was, however, one of the fortunate. He had the nerve and ruthlessness as well as the particular care of formularies which always must outdo the less earnest Richard-the-Seconds of life, and so, in due course, with a ‘collation’ preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the King, lying upon a cloth of gold before the high altar of the Abbey, was anointed. ‘After this anointing his body was lifted up into another place and there with great solemnity he was crowned.’

We leap forward to the too-brief reign of his son, the glorious fifth Harry, and his victory at Agincourt, told in this Chronicle with the evident conscious pride of a patriotic Englishman, to that King’s return from France in November, when he was met on Blackheath—often a pivot of historical events—by the Mayor and aldermen, with thirty thousand men in attendance. Thence they marched in joyous procession to London Bridge, whereon great lions and giants were standing. ‘And on the drawbridge stood St George royally armed, and at the cross in Chepe there was made a castle and thereon was much

solemnity of angels and virgins singing merrily.' And so to St Paul's. Henry's marriage and Queen Katharine's coronation followed shortly afterwards with a banquet consisting, it appears, mainly of fish and of such wide variety of choice that in the third course we discover fresh sturgeon, whelks, and roasted porpoise named in order together.

But as historians keen to recognise the ironic often have noted, the fame which may accompany the most brilliant of princes often is strikingly brief. Henry died early and while still in the full blaze of his glory, and was succeeded by his only son, who, through a lack of the spirit of his father and possibly the inheritance of insanity from his French grandsire, eventually brought himself and his claims to the crown of France to disaster. Irony almost outdid itself in his case, for the downfall was rapid and irrecoverable, his armies having encountered 'a witch, a woman in whom the Dauphin and all the King's adversaries had great affiance and held her as a prophetess and a goddess come out of the said town of Compiègne well-armed, with many captains, knights, and squires and others which were discomfited. And the witch that they called the Pucelle de Dieu was taken.' Meanwhile, the queen-mother, Katharine, had married Owen Tudor, who, although we are told that he was 'no man of birth,' was yet evidently a furious fellow, for he had been able to break out of his imprisonment in Newgate through the help of a priest after foully hurting his keeper. 'But, at the last, blessed by God,' breathes the Chronicler, 'he was taken again, the which Owen had privily wedded Queen Katharine, and had three or four children of her,' unknown to the common people until she was dead and buried. From that union, incongruous as it must seem to the calm eyes of history, came the dynasty of the Tudors with their peculiar qualities, imperfections, and perversities.

Henry VII, the first of them, appears in these pages as rather a sinister figure, cold-hearted, selfish, avaricious, and subtly revengeful. His greed was insatiable and his cruelty absolute, as was shown in his pitiless execution of the young Duke of Warwick, the son of 'false perjured Clarence,' who, although his father had been attainted for treasons by his brother Edward IV, was yet, through his

blood, a possible rival to the disputable throne. Henry was not the man to run needless risks ; especially as the risks to his security were many, as was shown by the number of claimants who appeared with the assertion that they were one or other of the lost princes, the sons of King Edward, whom rumour had loosely declared were murdered by Richard of Gloucester in the Tower. Our Chronicler recorded those rumours, but their unreliability is evident, for, as he shows, some said the princes were murdered between two feather-beds, and some that they were drowned in malmsey, and others that they were ' stykkid ' with a venomous potion. The appearance of the ' mawmets,' Perkin Warbeck and others and the good faith and followings they got showed, however, that the accusations made earlier against Richard were no longer much believed in by the general people ; while the extraordinary cruelty and contemptuous hatred with which his body and memory were treated by his triumphant enemies after the crushing defeat at Bosworth, given with close detail in this Chronicle, prove that the virtuous Henry and his associates were as capable of causing the deaths of the princes—if ever they *were* murdered—as was the slain King, who in a world of vilest treacheries had no one to say a brave word for him. The question must remain insoluble with a thousand others.

With the Tudors came also an unusual splendour in decoration and clothing. Every event that could lend itself to the glamour of pageantry was made to shine gloriously with colours and jewels. In most of those historical and royal parades the City played worthily its part. But first it had to follow the rules and settle precedents, as when, in 1503, the new Mayor, our afore-said Sir John Shaw, went with his aldermen to the King's Barons at the Exchequer in Westminster for him to be formally accepted. According to custom they journeyed thither in a barge ; but as the Mayor was short of stature he decided that they should ride on horse-back to and from the Thames and thereby established a precedent. Afterwards, instead of enjoying the banquet which followed the presentation in their own houses or halls of fellowship, he established a further precedent by holding the feast for the first time in the new Guildhall ; but, as the Chronicler dryly adds—and it is probable that he

shared the experience—'that time it was full raw and far out of order for that business.' Such occasions, and this was more than four centuries ago, emphasise the unique traditions of the City Corporation.

Shortly thereafter Katharine of Aragon arrived from Spain to be wedded to Prince Arthur, and London gave itself lavishly to ensure her fine welcome. As she proceeded from Lambeth, through Southwark and over London Bridge to the Bishop of London's palace, she was greeted at points on the way with tributes of verse declaimed by some astounding celebrities, represented in costume by women and men. There were Saints Katharine and Ursula, a Senator, a Nobleman and, at the next pause in the progress, a young woman who represented Virtue. Then the Princess was acclaimed by the Archangel Raphael, supported by King Alphonso of Castille, who was an astronomer, with Job and Boethius. An image of King Arthur, armed and seated in a golden chair, was the next to greet her, through the voice of an orator; until finally, having come to the Standard Inn, where King Henry and his Queen were awaiting her, she was welcomed by no less a personage than God himself—the Father of Heaven being all formed of gold and clothed in a cope of cloth of tissue garnished with jewels and seated amid 'gyrarchies' of angels, with candles of wax burning before Him.

The marriage with its feasts and joustings, in which the youthful Prince Hal, who was to grow into the lusty, lustful, and 'bluff' king, played a gallant and graceful part, was celebrated with increasing magnificence as the days went by. The notable extravagance of the Tudors and their courtiers as revealed in costly attire and jewels was more extravagant than ever. Sir Thomas Brandon wore a chain worth 1400*l.* (in the money of that day), and the Master of the King's Hawks one worth 1000*l.* The Duke of Buckingham's gown of needle-work set upon cloth of tissue furred with sables was valued at 1500*l.*, and so with others; while in the jousts a fitting background to the bright garments of the ladies and lords, the armed fighters and the dancers was set by the richly coloured and ornate chapels, pavilions, and tents which surrounded the tilting-ground. In loving detail the glowing particulars are set down by the Chronicler and

described with a zest which showed how absolutely he enjoyed his task. (Fabian it may be noted, happened to belong to the Fellowship of Drapers.) 'And thus these Jousts and Triumphs finished to the great honour of the King.'

But throughout the feudal times, until the Renaissance came with world discoveries and a new hemisphere, and the growth of commerce, all or most of that magnificence was thinly superficial—and worse; for behind the trumpets and the gold was much evil passion. In these pages one sees how easily the bosom friends of yesterday could become the pitiless enemies of to-morrow. Politics and ambition then were poisoned, rancorous, and cruel. Yet with all the duplicities and treacheries, which it is easy to call, in Shakespeare's word, *Italianate*, there was a frankness outspoken enough to be brutal; while violence, often with treachery added, was promptly available and sometimes could be hired to settle an argument. So that with all their glittering beauty, those Middle Ages were not entirely misnamed when they were called Dark, for the seven or seventy deadly sins were then fiercely rampant and only to be checked not so much through the charity of true religion as through its complicated and considerable superstitions and the fears they gave rise to. The result was unsettlement everywhere, with the iron hand of the law generally on the side of wrong. Rebellions were frequent and, almost as frequently, were harshly suppressed. Heresy was rampant. Lollardy, with its own crop of narrowness and harshness, gave freely of its martyrs, who often were burnt with the gallows they were hanged upon. Wizardry and witchcraft wove their spells, further to darken humanity through their tangled involutions.

Rovers and robbers infested the high-roads, woods, and forests. They were no Robin Hoods, for they lacked all grace and such romance as popular legend had attached to the hero of Sherwood in his Lincoln green; while popular discontent was widespread, deep, and justified through ill-government by weak monarchs, a brutal and depredating baronage, the grasping exactions of a proud Church, and other troubles and injustices; so that demagogues like Jack Sharpe of Abingdon and Wat Tyler, whose nickname might have been Jack Straw,

flourished for a time ; with, outstanding from the mass for his decision and mettle, Captain Jack Cade, whose mustering of discontents and rising at Blackheath 'to reform the common-weal of this land' our Chronicler tells in a manner which suggests that those malcontents had much of his sympathy. Indeed, it seems that if Cade could have controlled those of his followers who were too eager to revenge in blood the ill-government and rapacities they had suffered, his rising might have been of value to the whole of the kingdom and community. As it was, he was captured in a Sussex garden, brought to London, 'that all men might see him,' and beheaded and quartered at Newgate. His head was set upon London Bridge and his four quarters were sent unto four divers towns in Kent. And 'there were so many judged to death, that twenty-three heads stood upon London Bridge, upon whose souls and all Christians, God to his pleasure have mercy. Amen.'

A part of the continuous attractiveness of the Great Chronicle comes from the touches of humanity—of nature—which, here, there, and frequently, warm its progress. They cast glimpses which reveal the truth that those people of long ago, in their grades and classes, their hopes, disappointments, rejoicings, prejudices, and fears, were very like ourselves. Here are impressions taken at random. There was the case of Lord Strange, on a Sunday in 1416, cursed in every London church with bell, book, and candle because he had slain a member of the Fishmongers' Company who tried to prevent his quarrelling during the service in St Dunstan's in the East ; and that of the two-year-old Henry VI brought for the first time to London in his mother's lap and crying so heartily on the way that the journey had to be interrupted for a night at Staines to restore His Majesty's good temper ; and that of the Parliament of Bats at Leicester, so-called because men, having been warned not to bear swords to it, shouldered great bats and, when they too were forbidden, 'took good great stones in their bosoms and in their sleeves' ; and of Cade putting on the velvet finery of a fallen warrior, 'and so of a Knave was made a Knight,' and of the same knightly knave, in his brief hour of success, striking London Stone with his sword, 'like a conqueror.' And that of an enquiry in

1469 into acts of treason at Guildhall, with the Duke of Clarence present, when the Mayor, who was the chief judge, 'being a replete and lumpish man, slept, whereupon the Duke in derision said, "Sirs, speak softly, for the Mayor is asleep"' ; and of the young son of the Earl of Desmond who, having a boil, pleaded with the executioner, 'Gentle godfather, beware of the sore in my neck' ; and of Joan Boughton, that 'old cankered heretic,' a Wycliffite, who though eighty years of age was so resolute to die for her unpopular faith that all the doctors of divinity in London could not turn her from her purpose and so—brave, poor soul!—she was burnt and her ashes preserved by her followers as a relic ; and of Katharine of Aragon, borne on a litter in her coronation procession, compelled through a storm of rain to shelter under the awning of a draper's stall. The Chronicle throughout its length has many such glimpses which illuminate and make real the everyday life of the rare and the common people in those curious times.

Almost stranger to our eyes than the ways of mankind then were the ways of Nature as here told, especially in the simplicities of the earlier entries. Phenomena apparently were plentiful then. Doubtless with our over-lighted towns and villages we are unable to see the wonders of the night-sky as easily as our forefathers could ; and it happened, therefore, that comets rare with us were then frequent, foretelling marvels, or, as with that of 1473, bringing mortality and death 'with other inconveniences.' It must, however, be remembered that astrology was at that time the unique science of the stars, and the heavens were closely studied for their occult significance and predictions. There were also, with 'other marvels,' frequent earthquakes, or 'quaves.' One may venture to wonder if or why that was so ; but assuredly the everyday man of those times seems to have been more sensitive to the moods of Nature than the majority of us now can be. Possibly, however, these phenomena were not so numerous as might appear, for the Chronicle covers a period of more than four centuries and the average number of strange events, therefore, may not be so excessive—while we, too, have our marvels and our headlines.

They certainly had their full share of wonders in those

observant times. The first, recorded in 1202, is of great rains, lightnings, thunders, and of hail-stones big as eggs falling with the rain, at the same time as the awed people saw birds flying with burning coals in their bills, through which houses were burnt. Nearly three hundred years afterwards, in another notable hailstorm which fell in Bedfordshire, the stones had a circumference, it is said, of eighteen inches, and it is not surprising that they did much harm to the corn. The effects of lightning evidently were especially and naturally feared. Not only in 1359 were trees and horses smitten so that they perished ; but ' the devil in man's likeness spoke to men going by the way.' And seventy years later the power of the lightning was so ' inestimable ' that the shaft of St Paul's steeple was set on fire. The fury of the wind also caused much havoc. In the reign of Henry III, coming from the north-east, it cast down many houses, steeples, and turrets and ' fared foul ' with woods and orchards ; while ' fiery dragons and wicked spirits in great number were seen openly in the air flying.' The steeple of Bow Church was blown down, destroying many people ; and the weathercock of St Paul's, which had been recently renewed and set up again with pride, was lifted from its socket by the wind and driven the length of the churchyard. Of other strange things recorded we find that once the sun for hours was turned to blood and that twice two moons were to be seen, it being remarked on the second occasion that there were also two Popes then in Christendom.

Fascinating as this survey of the Great Chronicle certainly is, the tendency to linger further over its narrative of historical facts and theories and human peculiarities must now be resisted. The work reveals a smaller and yet an elaborately complex world, providing a stage which to us seems of narrow compass, yet to the many who strolled for their times across it its range was universal. The hub of the world, which to the old astronomy was the divinely favoured centre of all existence, was Rome to many, but also to true citizens of England it was as assuredly their own London, with its civic confidence and importance. From that centre (whether it was London or Rome) the universe stretched even to the *Primum Mobile*. To contemplate the activities and

miseries, with the splendour of the frequent circumstance that surrounded those kings, queens, churchmen, aldermen, lawyers, merchants, heretics, rebels, and, as must have been, most wretched outcasts, as they appear in this Chronicle, is to feel at once unity with them and a deep sympathy for them.

Well, they have gone, but the City, to which this book belongs, with all the alterations inevitable to the passing of periods and fashions and the coming of the uncertain privileges of modern progress, remains in many ways much the same. As Lord Wakefield, who is entitled to the last word, says in his introduction to this work, a vivid and curious picture is shown of

' a London so materially different from our own and yet so strangely the same in spirit. If the citizens were more passionately concerned with doctrinal uniformity and more prejudiced by commercial rivalries than to-day, yet we find in the author's outlook the same belief in justice and fair dealing, the same capacity for sympathy, the same preference for temperate ways of life and thought, the same civic and national patriotism, and, it may be added, the same delight in pageantry and ceremony, which are characteristic of the modern Londoner. In these persistent traits of character shown by her citizens from century to century we may see the secret of London's greatness to-day and the promise of her continued prosperity and pre-eminence.'

And so may it ever be ! Domine dirige Nos !

Art. 6.—'FRIGHTFULNESS' IN THE AIR.

Two remarkable pronouncements have recently been made by eminent American citizens. One was contained in a letter addressed to the 'New York Times' of March 7 by Mr Stimson, the former Secretary of State. In it he suggested that the United States should declare its intention to take common action with Great Britain and France in the event of an attack upon those countries by a Fascist Power. Such an attack, he said, might come 'at almost any moment.' The result might be a situation in which the powerful fleet of the third partner of the Fascist group—Japan—would be free to attack Singapore, Australia, New Zealand, and even western Canada. Defence against such joint action could be effective only if the naval power of the three large democracies, including the United States, took common action, and 'the conviction that such common action was in contemplation would be most potent to prevent attack altogether. A threatened or devastated France or Britain or Holland,' he added, 'might be forced to cede to a Fascist nation some of its possessions in the western hemisphere or the Orient, or make commitments to that nation which would be even more dangerous to our safety. Would our position be bettered for waiting for that to occur?'

The other pronouncement was made by no less a person than a former President of the United States, and it is perhaps an even more notable proof of the change in American sentiment induced by recent events in Europe. On Feb. 5, 1939, Mr Herbert Hoover declared that the United States might be drawn into a European conflict if 'a wholesale attack was made upon women and children by the deliberate destruction of cities from the air.' The Washington correspondent of 'The Times,' commenting upon the ex-President's statement in that journal on Feb. 6, added: 'Unless this is not the design of German and Italian strategists, the words of the former President should be carefully studied.' That it is indeed the design of German strategists their words and acts leave little room to doubt. We have Field-Marshal Göring's admission, indeed glorification, of the terrible rôle which his large air striking force was intended to play in the September crisis if it had culminated in war. 'In

those days we were ready. One command and a hell, an inferno would have been created for the enemy ; a short blow, but his destruction would have been complete.' We have the evidence, too, of what the German airmen serving with General Franco have actually done. The signs and tokens of the wrath to come are clear.

They are clear, too, in regard to the air strategy of Italy in a future war. As long ago as 1931 the Fascist Government made its conception of air warfare plain in the manœuvres carried out in the August of that year in northern Italy. Leaflets were dropped by aircraft on the town of Spezia containing the following warning : 'Italians : In case of war enemy aircraft will not drop coloured papers on your towns and homes, but powerful explosive and incendiary bombs. The enemy airmen will fire real bullets and will drench the streets of towns not with the white vapour of the air manœuvres but with a deadly rain of poison.' The 'deadly rain of poison' then foretold did in truth descend upon the earth, but on the earth of Abyssinia, not of Italy. Spain was spared that particular visitation—one wonders why—but not the deluge of 'powerful explosive and incendiary bombs.' There is abundant evidence that Italy, no less than Germany, will have small scruple about employing methods of frightfulness in the air if they promise a quick victory. In her dreams of Ilion falling, Rome arising, she has visions, one can hardly doubt, of blazing cities. That these visions are likely to be dissipated when the French *chasse* squadrons go through the Italian bombers like a scythe will not prevent an attempt to clothe them with reality.

It is true that many of the reports of ruthless and indiscriminate bombing both in Spain and in China have to be discounted to a material extent. There is a considerable element of propaganda in them, and in propaganda there are usually exaggeration and always a tendency to ignore inconvenient facts. Lord Trenchard had some wise remarks to make upon this subject when he spoke in the House of Lords on March 15 last.

'Whatever was bombed in another war,' he said, 'nothing they could say or do would prevent enemy propaganda—and our own—from asserting that women and children were bombed intentionally ; because, of course, a large number of

women and children would undoubtedly be hit. . . . If the Woolwich Arsenal were to be completely obliterated by a thousand bombs, all England would be told that women and children living in the houses nearby had been hit and not a word would be said about the destruction of the Arsenal. It was no use reporting that a man was killed—he was of no news value.'

He spoke in the same strain in commenting, as chairman, on a paper read at the Royal United Service Institution on Jan. 4. 'The lecturer,' he said, 'did not refer to the curious fact that every bomb that is dropped from the sky seems to be aimed always at a woman or child. I sometimes wonder whether they have a magnet in their head which attracts bombs. Whatever we do, it will be called reprisals.' There is always and naturally a tendency upon the part of a community which has suffered a bombardment at once to exaggerate its effect and to emphasise the barbarity and lawlessness of the enemy's action. Reports made at the time of the occurrence have to be taken with a good deal of caution; and sometimes such reports are accepted too uncritically by subsequent commentators. Mr John Langdon-Davies, for instance, in his 'Air Raid,' states that in the raids of March 17-19, 1938, upon Barcelona, 3000 people were killed and 25,000 injured. The figures announced by the Mayor of Barcelona on March 26 were 875 killed and 1,500 wounded. There is no reason to doubt that Mr Langdon-Davies was relying on eye-witnesses' accounts which both they and he honestly believed to be correct.

So, too, one has to remember, in reading press correspondents' reports of air raids, that they are *ex parte* statements in so far as they are derived, necessarily, from information afforded by the authorities or people of the bombed locality. The full facts are not always known on the spot. It is almost certainly true that most of the air bombardments in both Spain and China have been directed at military objectives: it is the residue which is ominous for the future. Of 46 raids upon Alicante investigated by the British Commission of two—Group-Captain R. Smyth-Pigott and Lieut.-Colonel F. B. Lejeune—41 were found by them to have been directed at the port area or railway stations. In a good many of these raids, as a result of the unfortunate situation of the

town, 'overs' and 'shorts' hit the civilian area instead of the port. In a few others (e.g. in the raid of May 25, 1938) the town itself was deliberately attacked. Occasionally, it is recorded, bombs were 'deliberately or haphazardly' dropped on a scattered residential quarter. The evidence of this Commission must be regarded as both expert and impartial. It is the more impressive on that account when it pillories a particular bombardment as having been indiscriminate.

The Commission in their report, issued on Sept. 1, 1938, condemned in unequivocal terms some of the recent bombardments conducted at other places than Alicante. The raid on Torrevieja on Aug. 26, for instance—a raid conducted from a low altitude—was stigmatised by them as a deliberate attack upon a defenceless civil population. Again, at the end of November 1938 they issued a report condemning the bombing of Tarragona on Nov. 7. There were no military objectives of any kind, they stated, in the town, which was entirely undefended. Their comments, issued early in January 1939, upon the raid on Barcelona of New Year's Eve were equally severe. 'All the evidence in their possession,' they stated, 'indicated a deliberate attack on human life with bombs designed for that purpose, at a moment when streets might be expected to be more than usually crowded, in a part of the city where civilians, since March 1938, deemed themselves to be immune.' The bombing of Granollers on May 31, 1938, was investigated not by the Commission but by Mr J. H. Leche, the British Minister at Barcelona, who visited the place on the following day. He reported that there were barracks, a store for aero engines, a generating station, and a railway bridge and station *outside* the town, but these had not been bombed. It was the town itself which suffered 'the full force of the bombardment.' Here was another clear instance of resort to terroristic methods.

Sometimes towns and villages in Spain were destroyed from the air as a means of blocking roads running through them and thus impeding communication with the front lines. Such was apparently the motive for the almost complete destruction of Falset, on the road from Barcelona to Gandesa, on July 29, 1938. No less than 200 bombs were rained on this small town; bombs dropped in Spain

were largely of 100 kilos weight, but sometimes of 200, 300, or even 500 kilos. Pons, Borjas Blancas, and other small towns behind the Catalan front were 'smashed down into the street,' said the special correspondent of 'The Times' at Hendaye in December 1938, for a similar reason. To many, the destruction of Guernica in April 1937 would be the outstanding instance of *Schrecklichkeit* in the air. Beyond question, the town was heavily bombed by Junker and Heinkel machines in the Nationalist service, but the havoc may have been completed by incendiarism for which Basque and Asturian troops are alleged to have been responsible. The facts are disputed. If the Basque and Republican accounts are true, then no more disgraceful incident stands to the discredit of the German auxiliaries of General Franco. The bombing of Durango a little earlier was only slightly less discreditable. The Marques de Merry del Val has admitted that the Nationalist airmen made an unfortunate mistake when they bombed a church crowded with worshippers.

Mistakes, indeed, there must have been in plenty. The bombs were often dropped from great altitudes: from as much as 25,000 feet, according to the statement of Mr Cyril Helsby in a paper read at the Institution of Structural Engineers on Dec. 20, 1938. Not all observers would agree with his estimate, but that they were dropped from 16,000 feet in the raids on Barcelona in March 1938 and from 15,000 feet in the raid on Granollers in June was stated by Mr. J. H. Leche in his reports on those bombardments. In attacks from such a height the bombs would be released by fast aircraft at a distance of two to three miles before they arrived over their objectives. This fact would not necessarily imply inaccuracy of aim; after all, the guns of racing warships are trained on other racing warships, sometimes unseen, at far greater ranges; but it does mean that absolute precision is not to be expected where the objective is not a large one. In any case, it has no bearing upon the bombardment of a place in which there are no military objectives at all, or even of a large, well-defined residential area of a city in other parts of which military objectives may be situated. The raids on Canton on March 28-30, 1938, and on Chungking on May 3-5, 1939, were flagrant examples of bombardments of the latter kind.

When all allowances are made it cannot seriously be disputed that the only possible explanation of many of the air bombardments both in Spain and in China can have been the desire to terrorise the civil population. The raids on Spain certainly lend little support to the argument that General Franco was disposed to spare towns which would shortly be in his possession. Except at Madrid, which was not bombed after February 1937, though it was bombarded after that date by artillery, one can see little evidence of solicitude on the part of the Nationalist airmen for Spanish life and property. Indeed, it has been contended that the ideological character of the war made it particularly merciless. There is more substance in the argument that the bombing forces employed in Spain were small as compared with those which would be in action in a major war. It is equally true, however, that the numbers of interceptors and anti-aircraft guns which would be available for defence in a great war are certain to be immensely larger than those at the disposal of the Republican authorities in Spain; the Nationalists were more adequately equipped in this respect, but even their defences were hardly comparable to those of a great Power. Except for a brief period at the beginning of 1937 the Republicans were always inferior in air strength to their opponents. In many of the Nationalist raids no serious opposition was encountered by the attackers. The bombers are very unlikely to have matters so much their own way in a major war. The struggle for the mastery of the air is certain to be far more intense.

Nevertheless, what has happened in Spain and in China too is not without its bearing upon the probable character of a greater conflict, and it is far from comforting to those who had cherished the hope that the air operations of the future would be waged with humanity and moderation. In Spain the German and Italian air forces have tried their paces in a kind of preliminary canter for the stiffer fences which they will have to face some day, and it must be admitted that they have not shown themselves to be very considerate horsemen. There has been some distinctly foul riding. The fact that gas has not been used from the air is one of the few reassuring signs. There is certainly no warrant for the belief that the totalitarian Powers' air forces will feel any scruples about attempting

the 'deliberate destruction of cities' to which Mr Hoover referred if it promises any military advantage. It is probable, indeed, that the mass slaughter of civilians from the air will be among the methods which they will adopt in a future war of unlimited endeavour.

That is evidently the expectation of our own Government. One may confidently affirm that it is no part of our own programme to slaughter civilians from the air. It is equally certain that we are not crediting a potential enemy with any similar self-restraint. The preparations which are being made all over this country, even in areas in which there are no military targets whatever, are clear evidence of our apprehension. War is, of course, not inevitable: the Prime Minister and his colleagues have said so again and again. If, however, it does come, that it will be waged ruthlessly is clearly also their view.

Much of what is being done would otherwise be entirely meaningless. The provision, for instance, of fifty million gas masks, of 300,000 hospital beds for air-raid casualties in the first fortnight of war, of 100,000 extra bedsteads and mattresses, and so on, would be sheer waste of money on any other supposition. Evidence in the Government's possession, one must conclude, goes to show that the war will be a massacre of civilians, that cities will be indiscriminately bombed, that men, women, and children will be gassed in their homes or in the streets, that there will be no attempt to spare even hospitals (else why not arrange now for the marking of them?), that we shall see all around such destruction of life and property as even Attila or Alaric never accomplished.

It is true that there is another and a more subtle reason for the vast preparations which we are making against air attack. They are intended in part at least to impress the potential enemy and to let him see that the worst which he can do will not catch us unprepared. The measures of passive defence supplement those of active defence. War is waged in two stages to-day—the stage of intensive arming and pre-war propaganda and the stage of actual encounter. In the first the potential combatants, besides piling up their intimidating masses of armaments, engage in a kind of psychological conflict. They act, on a bigger scale, in the manner of a couple of boxers who are to meet for a championship match. They

'talk big' at one another, the idea being to bring the other fellow into the ring suffering from a complex of defeatism. One may proclaim that he 'packs a punch' which will make short work of his opponent. The other may point to his porcupine-like capacity for countering it. So two nations 'talk big' at one another if they foresee an armed clash in the future. The side contemplating aggression will naturally lay the greater emphasis on the annihilating power of its attack; the other side will as naturally insist on its power of defence. Both have in mind, in fact, an external audience as well as one at home, and much that is said or done is meant for foreign consumption primarily.

Nevertheless, behind all this tendentious publicity there is a solid background of real apprehension. Undoubtedly the Government and people of our country, at any rate, believe that if war cannot be averted it is likely to take the form of widespread and devastating attacks from the air. The issue will depend then upon two things: first, the success or failure of the defence, active and passive, organised to meet the attacks; secondly, the maintenance or collapse of the national morale under the stress of the assault. The existence of these two factors of the problem explains why there is some illogicality or inconsistency in the pronouncements of Ministers bearing upon the critical situation that may arise.

It explains why those pronouncements seem to be designed at times to make our flesh creep and at times to be intended as a dose of soothing syrup for our nerves, and why, for instance, though a huge reserve of hospital beds is mentioned, a reserve of coffins (presumably needed also) is not. On the one hand the Minister of Health warns the nation (on March 2, 1939) that since 'it is possible to fly across this small island in twenty minutes and from end to end of it in a couple of hours . . . nobody could assume that any place by virtue of its position would be safe.' The Home Secretary, on the other hand, reassures us by pointing out (on Jan. 26, 1939) that an enemy could spare only a part of his air force for raiding expeditions against this country and that it is as harmful to overrate the danger as to underrate it. He denounced the alarmists, the 'jitterbugs'; yet six weeks earlier (on Dec. 14, 1938) the Lord Chancellor had

put up our blood-pressure by disclosing that 'the Germans had it in their power to drop 3,000 tons of bombs in a single day' and that 'in the first week or two of war they might do an amount of damage in London and other great cities which would amount in money to 500,000,000L.'

Lord Maugham's warning was underlined by Sir John Anderson a week later. On Dec. 22, 1938, he informed the House of Commons that 'what Barcelona had suffered by air raids is quite trivial by comparison with what might happen in this country if we were ever unfortunately engaged in a major war.' The disaster in store for us in that event could not be avoided by burrowing underground; there was no such thing, he said on March 1, 1939, as a 'bomb-proof shelter'; neither he nor his experts knew what such a shelter meant. 'It may well be that, though bombs may not penetrate a structure, concussion on a particular type of structure with a particular resonance, especially the monolithic type, might kill everyone in it.' 'You may take to your caves, they'll be only your graves,' sang Kipling's barrack-room poet to the tribesmen of the North-West Frontier; and 'just send in your chief and surrender' was the moral to be drawn by the destined victims of our screw-guns' fire. A like moral is not intended to be drawn, one must presume, from our Ministers' insistence upon the devastating qualities of an enemy's bombing attack. The purpose is rather to bring home to the nation the need for urgent preparation to meet it. Yet the effect may be the dissemination of general despondency, of a feeling of hopelessness, of the precise mentality the reaction of which to shock action in the air may be just what an enemy would desire.

'It is no exaggeration,' said Lieut.-General Sir Gerald Ellison in a letter to 'The Times' of Dec. 29, 1938, 'to say that hitherto those responsible for A.R.P., from Cabinet Ministers to A.R.P. wardens, have terrorised the civilian population by impressing on them that salvation lies mainly, if not wholly, in burrowing underground, the deeper the better. As one A.R.P. official explained to me recently, "If we don't put the fear of God into people they'll do nothing."' That is, indeed, the dilemma. People have to be scared into believing

in the reality of the danger if they are to do their part in organising the necessary measures of passive defence. The danger is that the scaring may be almost too effective and that something approaching a condition of panic may be induced. It is a disgrace, a blot upon our civilisation that populations of whom 90 per cent. desire only to live in peace should thus be the hapless pawns in a game of Power politics—a grim game in which there is no chivalry and no mercy.

The bombardment of cities from the air is a foul method of warfare which no dialectic can excuse. In so far as the object is to win a war by the demoralisation of the civilian population it is, as Mr. Chamberlain stated in the House of Commons on June 21, 1938, 'absolutely contrary to international law.' That view, one may confidently affirm, would be endorsed by the Government and people of the United States. Is it presumptuous to suggest that President Roosevelt should declare to the world his Government's attitude to this question? The effect might be far-reaching. It would go far, in fact, to restrain not only indiscriminate bombardment but resort to war. Any war of aggression is likely to be begun by a sudden attack from the air. It is on that first stroke that the totalitarian States found their hopes of victory, for instance, in a war against Britain and France. Their long-term prospects in such a war are unfavourable. If they cannot win quickly they must know that they cannot win at all. They will gamble on the first throw. If it fails they are doomed. Hence the importance of a smashing blow at the outset.

Where that blow will fall can readily be foretold. 'The first rule of air strategy,' a distinguished British expositor of the theory of *la guerre totale* in the air has written,

'is, or should be, to rain down bombs relentlessly on those objectives in an enemy's territory the destruction of which is likely to be a knock-out blow. . . . If we should find ourselves on the outbreak of war with a European great Power we should do well to bomb her capital at first as she most undoubtedly would bomb ours. . . . It must be the right sort of women and children whom we kill. Small-town folk are no good at all, because they are not of much account in any case and the vocal efforts of the insignificant can be disregarded.'

Mass slaughter of urban populations is, in truth, the *arcanum vincendi* in these latter days. Tilly and Papenheim are reincarnated and armed with more terrible weapons of destruction. Here is a challenge to democracy, to that 'ancient faith' of which President Roosevelt spoke in his noble message to Congress. Nay, as 'The Times' said in a leading article on June 28, 1938, it is

'a vast danger to civilisation itself. The inescapable corollary of that theory [the totalitarian] is that a people so trained offers no distinction between combatants and non-combatants; and presumably victory can only be obtained by the indiscriminate destruction of the whole nation. It is a horrible conception, the general acceptance of which would imply the suicide of mankind. The British people . . . most emphatically rejects it. Nor does this country accept the bombing of towns as a lawful method of warfare among civilised States.'

The principle of government by the people will be as surely at stake in the next great war in Europe as it was in the war of 1861-65 in America. The issue of the war will affect the United States, as Mr Stimson has stated. If it is decided by the massacre of civilians from the air, a terrible precedent will have been set. The United States can help to avert the catastrophe. An ex-President has declared his conviction that his country may be drawn into the war if women and children are deliberately slaughtered in air bombardments. If President Roosevelt were to speak in similar terms he would add to the great service which he has already rendered to the cause of peace and freedom. We know already what the American Government thinks of indiscriminate bombardment from the air. Its view was made clear in the protest which the United States Ambassador at Tokyo handed to the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs on Sept. 22, 1937, under instructions from the Government at Washington. In that note of protest it was stated that the American Government objected to the jeopardising of the lives of its nationals and of non-combatants generally, and regarded the general bombing of an extensive area inhabited by a large population engaged on peaceful pursuits as 'unwarranted and contrary to the principles of law and humanity.' The American Government, it was added,

could not believe that the intimation by Japan that the whole Nanking area might be subject to bombing operations represented the considered intent of the Japanese Government.

The warning then given was not without its effect. A solemn warning now given in regard to the probable reaction of American opinion to the indiscriminate bombardment of western European cities, and the possible influence of that reaction upon American action, could hardly fail to impress even the Nazi régime. Herr Hitler and his advisers are not wholly without wisdom. If they could be convinced that the adoption of methods of frightfulness in the air would not pay, that its effect might be to tilt the balance of American sympathy for the democracies, already evident, towards actual intervention in arms, and that it would not be in fact the shortest and surest path to victory, they might well be brought to amend their programme. It is a programme, we know, of sharp and overwhelming attack. Germany, as General von Metzsch has said in a recent book, depends for a decision on the 'harder blow' rather than the 'longer wind.' The 'harder blow' will be first and foremost a blow in the air. It is for that that Germany's huge bombing force, 60 per cent. of all her first-line aircraft, has been built. It will be used, one can hardly doubt, against London, Paris, and other great cities. The fact that Berlin will suffer terribly in its turn will be little satisfaction for the British and French victims of *Schrecklichkeit*. If a warning from the powerful democracy of the western hemisphere made such a catastrophe for mankind a little less probable, it would surely be worth uttering now.

J. M. SPAIGHT.

Art. 7.—PHILOSOPHIC FOUNDATIONS OF POLITICS.

The Totalitarian State against Man. By Count R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi. Translated by Sir Andrew McFadyean. Muller, 1938.

IN the labyrinth of political theory there are many cul-de-sacs. Some of its prisoners have tried to push or wriggle ingeniously through to join forces with a fellow-investigator ; most have been content to reach a dead-end and to know that only retreat and a fresh start would lead elsewhere ; very few have perceived that elsewhere must always be another cul-de-sac. Yet in the labyrinth of political theory there is no through-way. It is no accident that thinkers of the past have failed to elucidate a ' true ' system of politics ; it is not their reproach that the war between Individualism and Absolutism continues still with a strength that has been in no way exhausted in the centuries since the great days of Athens and Sparta. Count R. N. Coudenhove-Kalergi knows this, and consequently makes no claims to be infallible where infallibility is not possible. Like many writers before him, he combines, in ' *The Totalitarian State against Man*,' the rôles of historian, sociologist, political guide, and philosopher ; but unlike them, he fully understands both the distinctions implicit in those rôles and the precise character of the problems that are proper to the consideration of each. That is one supreme merit of an important book. Such understanding not only explains the intrinsically indecisive nature of political doctrines in general, but also, and partly in consequence, discredits as nonsensical many of the superstitious prejudices upheld by those particular creeds which are in practice the most unpalatable.

As historian, Coudenhove-Kalergi is at pains to trace the origins of the modern liberal and totalitarian States, and to exemplify their dependence upon the degree of value attached to the idea of personal freedom. His account of the gradual development of liberalism in the world before the sudden growth in importance of industrial economic forces and the consequent illumination of class distinctions is as unconventional in its lucidity as it is

conventional as a topic. No less uncommon is the clarity of his comparison of Nazism and Fascism, a comparison which indicates the extent to which racial intolerance of Jews is foreign to Fascist ideology, in conformity though it may well be with the dictates of diplomatic expediency. As sociologist, Coudenhove-Kalergi makes a number of striking generalisations, both about human endeavour—'Every institution embodying right which has no might behind it must fail. It is for this reason that the League of Nations has failed' is an interesting example—and also about the causal relationship between the ends of individuals and state institutions; between, for instance, the liberal idea and democracy, equality and communism, order and dictatorship. His critical statements about democracy and political freedom expose the unwisdom of always associating those institutions in the same breath. Coudenhove-Kalergi is an optimistic Individualist who does not believe that Absolutism will prevail; he is convinced that the judicial State, as he calls it, will outlive the military dictatorship; he prophesies that the fundamental antagonism between political mechanisation and human nature, which he represents as the principal cause of disruptive tension in both internal politics and international affairs, will be but a phase, if a prolonged one. As political guide, then, Coudenhove-Kalergi is a striver after universal liberalism who looks to England to bring about a fraternal revolution in the minds of men which will rescue them from their present servitude to technical knowledge. But Coudenhove-Kalergi is also a philosopher. And above all other diversions his first love is the reinforcement of denunciatory criticism of the totalitarian State with the destructive asseverations of logical argument. He strengthens the pleadings of political guidance with the findings of political philosophy. It is this factor, rather than the more obvious worth of his calibre as chronicler and visionary, which makes the appearance of 'The Totalitarian State against Man' so noteworthy.

Objection might be taken to differentiation between political guidance and political philosophy on the ground that it is splitting imaginary hairs over synonyms. That attitude would be due to an over-hasty assumption that because of the superficial equivalence of the terms

themselves it must happen that the functions for which the terms stand are equivalent also ; and that is obviously not the case. On the contrary, without stretching those terms to mean more than they would normally, it is possible to show that what commonly goes by the name of political theory or philosophy consists chiefly of the mingling of the mental processes of the two sorts of men who may be called philosophers and political guides. The essence of distinction between the two is to be found in the difference in logical type of the propositions which they respectively formulate.

The classification of propositions according to their logical type, whatever its difficulty in practice, is in conception comparatively simple. If it is permissible to sum up the business of logic in one sentence, that business might be described as the analysis of truth in all its variations and the subsequent cataloguing on that basis of all the propositional forms that allow of significance for the human mind. To classify a proposition, therefore, according to its logical type is to decide, first, whether it is the kind of proposition which is capable of being true, and then in what sense it would be true if it were true. Whether the proposition in question is *actually* true or not does not matter to the logician ; his only concern is if and how it could be true. And from the logician's list of propositions that are potentially true by reason of their form a classification can be made of all the kinds of human knowledge, for knowledge is to be defined in terms of true propositions. Two conclusions follow : first, writings may claim to contain knowledge when and only when they embody true, or potentially true, propositions ; and secondly, if philosophy claims to represent a special kind of knowledge, it must formulate propositions of a special logical type. It is with reference to these conclusions that the distinction between the philosopher and the political guide has to be drawn.

The view that philosophy does and should occupy its own place in the realm of knowledge by contributing truths of a particular kind is now fairly common, as is the corollary which states that a philosophic truth is the analytic definition of a concept. At any rate it is not dogmatic to assert that the provision of definitions is at least part of the philosopher's duty. And when it is

added that the political philosopher should be regarded, at least in part, as the analyst of political concepts, this is not a request for undue credulity. The works of the majority of post-mediaeval political theorists are full of analyses, even if the body of their labours does consist of moral judgments, postulations of the ends of mankind, and exhortations to moral or political virtue. John Locke set out largely, indeed, to justify and extol the sanctity of private property, yet he endeavoured also to define the relation between political power and the natural rights of man, and he has been called the first philosophical analyst; the main object of Hobbes may have been to exhibit as a necessity blind obedience to a tyrannical sovereign, but he sought to prove that might is definable in terms of right and to analyse the relation resultant upon the alleged covenant between monarch and subject; like Hobbes, Spinoza and Hume discussed at length the dependence of duty and obligation upon self-interest, which they believed to be the guiding principle in man's political life; Rousseau, famed exponent of the Social Contract and the General Will, demonstrated by analysis that the chains laid by government upon free-born man do not really impair his freedom; John Stuart Mill's definitions of liberty and democracy are classic. This survey is neither penetrating nor exhaustive; but the point to be made is not so much that a large number of the great political thinkers were analytical philosophers as well as political guides, propounders of definitions as well as of precepts, as that such distinct aspects of political theorising do exist, even if their existence has not achieved due remark.

The definitions of political philosophers are contributions to knowledge. Like the propositions of mathematics, analytic definitions of concepts are held to be universally true, although the exact nature of their validity is a matter of dispute. The certainty of mathematics is due to mathematics being a logical deductive system based on certain assumptions which do not state facts about the physical world. Mathematics is concerned solely with the formal consequences of certain non-factual assumptions; and so is philosophical analysis. The proposition 'If Germans are Aryans, and Aryans are not Jews, then Germans are not Jews' is an analytic definition of the

ambiguous pseudo-factual statement 'Jewish German Aryans do not exist,' and it is true irrespective of whether or not there are Germans or Aryans or Jews in the world, since it asserts neither their existence nor non-existence. Every analytic definition of a word is a prescription of the rules which, on the basis of certain initial assumptions about language, govern the correct usage of that word; and those initial assumptions are arbitrary in the way that the first premisses of mathematics are arbitrary, yet also necessary in the sense that they are the constituents of intelligibility in language. In brief, propositions comprising analytic definitions have a truth-value, or validity, which is internal and independent of personal opinion. The precepts, on the other hand, of the political guide and the practical politician are *not* contributions to knowledge. The procedure of these men is to set forth the ends which they believe man to desire or recommend him to adopt, and then to discuss the best means of attaining them. And in so far as the inconstant difference between their respective functions can be summarised at all, it may perhaps be said that the sphere of the practical politician is limited to embrace those immediate, varying, finite ends the choice and pursuit of which is entrusted to the sovereign body of the State by the citizens; while the sphere of the political guide, the theoretical writer contains all the timeless, enduring, infinite ends which are each citizen's individual concern and the fundamental factor determining the constitution of the State and the character of the government. The spheres frequently overlap—at a General Election one man may turn his attention to both at once—but for the present purpose the only important consideration is that in either sphere the logical type of the propositions formulated is the same; and it is a type which debars its users from making contributions to knowledge. Postulation of ends takes the form either of a judgment that a given state of affairs is good or of an assertion that a given state of affairs ought to be pursued, and it is characteristic of such propositions that neither truth nor falsehood can significantly be attributed to them. The reason is plain. If one man approves a certain end and another disapproves, the absence of any objective standard of right or good ends makes it impossible to state that one is

voicing a truth and the other a falsehood. A German may put order before freedom in the hierarchy of chosen ends and a Russian may prefer equality to both, and who is there to judge between them? The selection of ends and the relative values awarded them are matters of personal taste, of emotional reaction; and in the last resort emotional preferences cannot be justified by argument. Nor does either a majority verdict or a religious doctrine add any *intrinsic* worth to ends. There is nothing illogical in the contention that when a man disputes an end accepted by the rest of the world his position is just as good as his opponents'; and religion cannot add any *objective* value to an end, since dissentients may refuse to accept its doctrinal standards and remain logically unassailable.

There can be no objective argument about ends as ends. Political guidance is like leading the horse to the water and pointing out alleged advantages that result from drinking water in general and this water in particular. And even when the theorist's postulated ends are accepted, his recommendations as to how they should be achieved are only hypothetical. They are of the form: If you want A, then you should do *x*, *y*, and *z*; and are consequently speculations which are not necessarily related in any way to ascertained fact. (These recommendations as to means are, however, very often based on fact. And when they are, that is to say, true factual generalisations to the effect that *x*, *y*, and *z* are always followed by A, they no longer belong to the speculative world of political guidance but to the scientific world of cause and effect. They are sociological propositions, sociology being an empirical science studying the laws which interpret man's behaviour as a social creature; and, as with all empirical sciences, its propositions are necessarily either true or false.) And so the political guide (when he is not quoting sociology) must be looked upon as an enlightened speculator and propagandist whose persuasive utterances are, in the most disinterested cases, dictated by the altruistic desire to increase the happiness of his fellow-citizens and, if—like Coudenhove-Kalergi—he is also an internationalist, the happiness of all mankind. Thus it is that he cannot furnish a deductive, and therefore 'true,' system of politics, inasmuch as his first premisses are

neither true in their own right nor demonstrable by argument.

But this demarcation of the limits of his scope does not, as might be imagined, lessen the importance of the task that the political guide fulfils; nor does it undermine his authority. To define his powers is not to deny them. To stress the hypothetical nature of the kingdom of ends is not to add to his hardships. For, in practice, the political guide and the politician assume that the people for whom they are writing or with whom they have to deal have standards and ideals similar to their own; and there is good reason for this assumption. It is a fact that those who are born to imbibe the same traditions, live in the same environment, receive the same cultural education, and embrace, perhaps, the same religious faith do tend to observe the same sense of values and to adopt the same ends. And only because this is so is it possible to dispute about matters of taste. When we dispute about a matter of taste, say a political end, we start with the presupposition that our opponent fundamentally likes and dislikes, approves and disapproves what we do; and from this position we set out to convince him, by making relevant *factual* statements, that what he is affecting to disapprove is really the sort of thing which he normally approves; or vice versa. And without that presupposition the argument would indeed be vain, since when we are faced with total disagreement there are no objective standards of value to which to make appeal.

While it is essential to affirm the utility to civilisation of the persuasive powers of the political guide, and to do homage to the influence he exerts by postulating ends and forming speculative policies from them, it is clear that he would carry more weight were he to propound objective truth. If he is to do this, it must be as philosopher, not as political guide. Can then the philosopher, whose method is to make definitions, have any control over man's political doctrines? Yes; in a special sense. The philosopher has no logical right to maintain that his definition of a concept necessitates from mankind a certain positive attitude towards it, but he may and should proclaim what attitudes involve, in the light of his definition, inconsistency or self-contradiction and so become indefensible. And these invincible tactics are not

only theoretically legitimate, but both practicable and actually used. Coudenhove-Kalergi uses them. This is, in fact, the second supreme merit of 'The Totalitarian State against Man': that although its author marshals all the persuasive force that discriminating advocacy of specific ends could have, in his attempt to discredit the political doctrines which he abhors he wields as well the irresistible weapon of analytical philosophy. He denounces and he annihilates too. He has seen that worship of the State as a metaphysical entity is not only deplorable but absurd.

Absolutist theories have as their headstone the idea that the State is in some mystical sense a super-personality; and because this idea results as much from fallacious thinking as from over-zealous search for a suitable object for hysterical adoration Coudenhove-Kalergi attacks its supporters on their own ground. As he shows, propositions asserting that the State is a god or demi-god are claimed to be deducible from the definition of the State; and the argument, in the simplest form, runs: Each individual is only a man; the State is the sum of many men; therefore it follows that the State as a creature is more than any individual man as a creature. And if the ambiguity of 'more than' is overlooked—it is used ethically or emotionally here in the conclusion, whereas the premisses are concerned with numerical quantity—the conclusion may be said to follow from the premisses; but that it is nevertheless false is indicated by Coudenhove-Kalergi. 'If the State were the sum of its citizens,' he says, 'the breakdown of the State would mean the end of its citizens. Not many years ago we witnessed the breakdown of a major State; but its citizens did not die as a result. . . .'* This might be regarded as

* Subsequently to the writing of this article a friend has observed that this quoted argument is misleading as it stands. In strict accuracy Coudenhove-Kalergi should have said: If the State were the sum of its citizens, the *end* (not the *breakdown*) of the State would mean the end of its citizens, etc. But of course the Russian State—the 'major State, referred to—did not cease to be after 1918; it was given a new impulse and a changed character. This admission does not, however, really vitiate his argument. If the State were the sum of its citizens it could be likened to a crop of corn. Now when a crop of corn is laid low in a storm, the individual living stalks composing it are *ipso facto* laid low, and the crop dies when the stalks die. And the point is that whereas the breakdown of the crop involves the death of its stalks *qua living stalks of corn*—they

sufficient refutation of the dogma that the State is the sum of its citizens; but to appreciate the cause of the error it is necessary to understand the properties of classes as opposed to those of collections.

A collection is an aggregate, a physical whole, which is arrived at by taking as one thing a number of individual elements. A forest, for example, is a collection of trees, trees being its individual elements; a village is similarly a collection of individual houses; and any individual entities can be mathematically summarised and given a collective name. Thus the sum of individual Englishmen is a collection, a collection of men with certain common characteristics; but it is not the English State. States are not collections, but classes. Now classes too are composed of individual elements, though they are not created by a process of grouping together physically, as are collections. Thus it follows that the same individual elements can compose both a collection and a class—individual citizens are the case in point—and it is precisely because they have confused the class of citizens with a collection of citizens that Absolutist philosophers have made their fallacious deductions as to the nature of the State. No doubt a forest, as a collection, is in some sense 'more as a creature' than individual trees are as creatures; and the same sort of comparative value could probably be predicated of a collection of citizens; but a collection of citizens is not equivalent to a State. The difference between a collection and a class is that whereas a collection is a whole, or 'thing,' a class is not a 'thing' at all. A forest is a thing because, like its individual elements, trees, you can touch it and you can cut it down; a State is not a thing because, unlike its individual elements, citizens, you cannot see it, you cannot talk to it; it has no sensible properties. Classes are logical symbols or constructions. A class-name such as 'State' is used to stand, not for a single physical whole, but for all of a number of individual entities which exhibit a common relation; and the entities in question are classed in terms demanded by the relation they exhibit. We class them

remain 'bits of stuff'—the breakdown of the Russian Empire did *not* involve the death of its citizens *qua* citizens. They continued to live together in (perhaps primitively) organised society, thus enabling the State to be reconditioned. So the State cannot in this way be likened to a crop of corn, or be called the sum of its citizens.

for convenience. Ayer says in 'Language, Truth, and Logic' that '... we may explain the nature of logical constructions (i.e. classes) by saying that the introduction of symbols which denote logical constructions is a device which enables us to state complicated propositions about the elements of these constructions in a relatively simple form.' A proposition containing a class-name can be translated into logically equivalent propositions about the properties which are common to certain entities, and in virtue of which those entities are elements of the class; or, as Bertrand Russell has put it in 'Our Knowledge of the External World,' '... all statements nominally about a class can be reduced to statements about what follows from the hypothesis of anything's having the defining property of the class.' This may be expressed loosely in the proposition that to say anything about a class is always to say something about its elements, not about itself as a 'something.'

The important conclusion to be drawn from this technical discussion of the nature of classes is that inasmuch as the State is a class, and classes are not 'things,' it is literally nonsensical to worship the State as a 'thing' or personality. Any proposition asserting that the State ought to be worshipped can only mean that citizens ought to worship themselves, or their citizenship—which is patently ridiculous. Yet as the correct manner of defining all classes, and the State in particular, also arises in the discussion, and as Coudenhove-Kalergi lays down in his book not only what the State is not, but what it is as well, his positive implications should perhaps be given the precise formulation they deserve. He has been content to represent the State as an instrument—this is a description of purpose, not a definition of nature—and to enumerate its tasks. And in the interests of clarity and simplicity this procedure is desirable, just so long as the consideration of 'tasks' does not lead to the erroneous belief that there must be a 'something' to have tasks, a belief which is the thin end of the wedge of Absolutism. The tasks Coudenhove-Kalergi ascribes to the State are four:

- 'to protect men against their fellow-men;
- to protect the State against men;
- to protect the State against other States;
- to protect men against the State.'

This is a fair summary of purpose, and its implications must be weighed when defining the State.

It follows from the analysis of classes that a precise definition of the State entails enunciation of the relations which hold between individual citizens and constitute them elements of a class. Accordingly, it would seem that 'State' is the name of that class which has as elements a considerable though unknown number of persons, who in bulk permanently inhabit the same territory ; who are in bulk permanently disposed to obey the laws of a known body of their own number, which body can and does exact obedience from them without itself being subject to any further body ; and who both recognise that there are other sovereign peoples related similarly to themselves, and have their own sovereign character recognised in return by those other sovereign peoples. Acceptable or unacceptable as this definition may be, its virtue in this context is that it is formal and general and couched, as all class definitions must be, in terms of the relevant elements.

By demonstrating the practical value of the definition Coudenhove-Kalergi has done philosophers and their tool, logic, an inestimable service. It remains an unfortunate fact that most people despise and dispense with the pronouncements of the logician on the ground that they are an invariably useless, and at times mischievous, concatenation of pedantic quibbles. Nor is this an entirely unreasonable view. Philosophers are themselves largely to blame. They are apt to be scornful of defending their labours at the bar of what is often, indeed, unsympathetic opinion. And yet, if the propositions of philosophy are a contribution to knowledge ; if in the world of politics philosophy can, by the definition of symbols, play the dual rôle of exposing doctrines based on logical fallacies and of helping man to form a clear judgment as to the political ends he would himself pursue, that is surely a function with a considerable practical value and one which it should be an offshoot of the philosopher's work to establish and justify. To define, be it repeated, is not to deny. Elucidation of the real nature of the State is no more a process of debunking than is the analysis which shows that the propositions of the political guide and the practical politician may not be called true. And just as logical examination of the utterances of the political

guide displays aright the altruistic motives which can give birth to them, so does representation of the State as a class and not a 'thing' outline in true perspective the unselfish acts which man may perform as a political animal. For although it appears that it is folly for men to worship the State, it does not thence follow that actions inspired by a man's patriotic feelings should be reckoned folly also. On the contrary, the inference is that they should not be demeaned by association with a faulty conception of their impelling force; the inference is that they should be 'ascribed where they are most justly due,' ascribed, that is to say, to the honourable love of fellow-countrymen and respect for the deeds and traditions of ancestors. The so-called fair name of the State, the maintenance of which will be considered an ennobling duty so long as the spirit of nationalism lives upon the earth, is seen to consist of the prestige won by that class which was composed of the forebears of the existing citizens; and in an analysis which presents it so there can be nothing to shock, though much to attract. For such an analysis has this advantage, that it allows no excuse for conversion of patriotism and pride of race into the idolatry which transforms good citizenship from an exhilarating into a degrading practice. It may be, too, that such an analysis furnishes a valuable background for the persuasive technique of the advocates of democratic government. Coudenhove-Kalergi, at least, believes that it does; and he who would be enlightened in this respect should turn with pleasant anticipation to the pages of 'The Totalitarian State against Man.'

PETER LEGH.

Art. 8.—A BIRD'S-EYE VIEW OF THE BALKANS.

'AGREEMENT between Italy and Yugoslavia is by no means impossible,' said an Italian Minister to me early in 1934. 'If Yugoslavia would accept Italian control of the Adriatic Sea, Italy might encourage Yugoslav claims to Salonika in compensation.' Then he added: 'Italy would prefer a strong Bulgaria to a weak Greece upon the Dardanelles.' This frank statement indicated that the eagles of Rome were already taking a bird's-eye view of the Balkans; it was a shrewd view through the baleful eyes of rapacious birds whose vision ranged westward to the Straits of Gibraltar, southward into the heart of Africa, and eastward to and beyond the Suez Canal. Indeed, the problems of the Balkans are closely linked with the strategy of the whole Mediterranean situation.

While the Mediterranean and its tributary seas remain open the combined fleets of Great Britain and France are able to command them; therefore it is Italy's policy to 'landlock' those seas by controlling or by allying herself with the countries which bound them so that her military strength, aircraft, and submarines, combined with those of Germany, may challenge Anglo-French naval power with reasonable hope of success. That was the purpose of Italian and German intervention in Spain. Beneath a smoke-screen of clever propaganda, which stirred in Great Britain and France an illogical sympathy with the Spanish ruling caste, Italy and Germany secured victory for 'Caudillo' Franco. In a general war Spain might remain *officially* neutral; yet she could immobilise large French garrisons upon her frontier by her doubtful attitude, place her valuable natural resources at the disposal of the Axis Powers, and throw open to those Powers her harbours and air ports with impunity, because Great Britain and France would hesitate to drive her into open collaboration with their opponents by launching a vast expedition to enforce her neutrality. If this is the price General Franco will pay for Italian and German aid 'against Bolshevism,' the Axis Powers have gained a dangerously strong position in the Western Mediterranean, which is bounded by Spain, Italy, and Sicily; they have reasonable hope of blocking British

communications with the Eastern Mediterranean by way of Gibraltar and Malta, and of severing France's lifeline with her North African possessions. Apart from the Straits of Messina (which Italy controls absolutely) and the narrows between Italian Sicily and Pantellaria and French Tunis, the Eastern Mediterranean may be reached only through the Suez Canal—which might be blocked. Moreover, Tunis is threatened from Italian Libya, Malta is uncomfortably close to Sicily, and the only other first-class naval harbour under British or French control in the Eastern Mediterranean is Alexandria, which is 800 miles from the nearest Italian coastline. It is in these circumstances that the Balkan States have become decisive factors in the situation.

Together the six Balkan countries (including Turkey and Albania) have a population of 65,000,000. In all of them agriculture is the main occupation, and they have found in Central Europe a ready market for their produce, a circumstance which has enabled the Axis Powers to gain over them a strong economic hold. And all of them are governed by methods which approximate more closely to those prevailing in the Axis countries than in the Western Democracies—Albania has passed under Italian rule; Yugoslavia preserves the façade of democracy, but the Prince Regent Paul pulls the strings; Bulgaria and Romania are ruled by monarchs with thinly veiled dictatorial powers; Turkey is under the dictatorship of a President; while in Greece a General dictates with the King as his counsellor.

Yugoslavia and Bulgaria are Slavonic countries—though there is in Bulgarian blood a strong intermixture of other strains; the two peoples have similar customs, understand each other's language, and belong (except for the Croat and Slovene Catholics and the Moslem minorities) to the same Orthodox Church, but the exaggerated ambitions of their rulers and the intrigues of foreign Powers have prevented their union and repeatedly plunged them into struggles they cared little about. The two countries are now bound by a Treaty of Friendship, signed at the behest of the Axis Powers, which are now endeavouring to detach Yugoslavia from the Balkan Entente Pact. This pact was concluded in February 1934 between Yugoslavia, Romania, Greece, and Turkey

for their mutual protection, and the three last partners, apprehensive of the Axis Powers' intentions, have now aligned themselves with the Western Democracies to confront a common danger; if they had joined the Axis Powers the latter would be predominant in the Eastern Mediterranean and Black Seas and would thus be assured of secure landlocked or overland routes into Asia and into Africa. Imagination boggles at what would follow.

Upon the security and co-operation of Greece and Turkey depend our power to support Romania and our security in the Eastern Mediterranean, for they control between them the straits through which our communications with Romania lie, while their harbours—if open to our warships—make it possible for us to hold the Axis Powers in check upon these seas. But upon land both these countries are threatened—Greece directly, through Albania, and Turkey indirectly, through Bulgaria; and both countries, which are mutually bound to defend their common frontiers, had foreseen the danger which became imminent when Italy occupied Albania on Good Friday.

Italy has always been interested in Albania because, though it is a small and mountainous country (with barely a million inhabitants), it is of great strategic importance. It lies at the bottle-neck entrance to the Adriatic Sea and is only 47 miles from the Italian coast at the nearest point. At this point there is the Bay of Valona, a deep and landlocked harbour from which a fleet hostile to Italy might control the Adriatic and seriously threaten Italy's exposed eastern coastline, for whereas the Yugoslav coastline is liberally endowed with harbours, there is no important naval harbour in the Italian coast between Trieste and Taranto.

In 1912 Italy co-operated with her ally Austria-Hungary to oppose the partition of Albania (hitherto a part of Turkey) between Serbia and Greece. Since neither Power would allow the other to annex Albania, they encouraged the proclamation of Albanian independence in November 1912; then they intrigued against each other for control of the Principality which all the Powers eventually agreed to establish, and the failure of the luckless Prince William to consolidate his position as ruler was due, in the main, to Italian double-dealing.

On Oct. 3, 1914, Italy, disregarding Albanian neutrality, seized the Island of Saseno, which lies across the bottle-neck entrance to Valona Bay. Two months later she occupied Valona, and soon afterwards extended this occupation throughout most of southern Albania. By the secret Pact of London of April 26, 1915, whereby she deserted her allies and joined the Entente Powers, Saseno, Valona, and a strategic hinterland were awarded to her, whereupon she agreed that provided she obtained also the Dalmatian coast from Austria-Hungary and the control of a small autonomous Central Albania, she would not oppose the partition of north and south Albania between Montenegro, Serbia, and Greece.

But in 1917 grew the idea that Serbia and Montenegro should unite with the South Slav Provinces of Austria-Hungary (Croatia, Slovenia, and other regions) in a united Yugoslav Kingdom, and this was formally agreed upon by the representatives of these countries at Corfu on June 20. Such union had not been foreseen when the Pact of London was concluded; together these countries would become a powerful State replacing Austria-Hungary as Italy's rival upon the Adriatic, and from this State she would be unable to withhold the Dalmatian coast. So without consulting her allies she proclaimed, on June 3, 1917, the unity and independence of the whole of Albania under her protection.

During the peace negotiations Italy strove at first to obtain an extension of Albania's pre-War frontier to north and south along the coast, though simultaneously insisting that the country should be her 'protectorate' and the Valona district her possession; but eventually, rather than abandon the Valona district (in which oil had been discovered) she agreed that considerable slices of Albania in the north and south should be awarded respectively to Yugoslavia and Greece, who claimed this compensation for strategic reasons. Thereupon the indignant Albanians rose against the Italians and drove them into Valona, which was besieged until Aug. 2, 1920, when Italy agreed to withdraw entirely from the mainland, though she retained Saseno island. In December 1920 Albania was admitted to the League of Nations. After some fighting and wrangling with Yugoslavia and Greece her frontiers were restored more or less as they

were in 1914; simultaneously Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan declared (on Nov. 9, 1921) that her independence and integrity were of international importance and their violation 'might constitute a danger for the strategic safety of Italy.'

After a period of 'growing pains' Amet Zogu became dictator and president of the Albanian Republic in January 1925, and set about the reconstruction of the country. But he required financial and technical aid. Neither the League of Nations nor any country except Italy was prepared to give him that aid; so he had to accept Italian assistance. An Albanian National Bank was founded under Italian control and a loan was granted, Italian technicians arrived to build necessary roads and bridges, Italian advisers were attached to all state departments, an unnecessarily extensive harbour was constructed at Durazzo, an elaborate military survey was made of the whole country, and an imposing Italian Military Mission under General Alberto Pariani (now Under-Secretary for War) reorganised and trained the Albanian Army. On Nov. 27, 1926, a Pact of Friendship and Security was concluded to safeguard 'the political, juridical, and territorial status quo of Albania,' but on Nov. 22, 1927, this pact was superseded by a Treaty of Defensive Alliance concluded for twenty years; it stipulated that 'all former Treaties between the High Contracting Parties after the admission of Albania into the League of Nations shall be fully and faithfully observed in accordance with the terms of the said Treaties in such manner as to assure complete amity between the two peoples and Governments,' which would 'devote all their energies to guarantee the security of their States and to mutual defence against any attack from abroad,' and that, in the event of war, each would 'put at the disposal of its ally all the military, financial, and other resources at its disposal if such aid is requested by the threatened party.'

On Sept. 1, 1928, with the full approval of Italy, Zogu was proclaimed Zog I, King of the Albanians; a year ago he married the Hungarian Countess Geraldine Apponyi, who gave birth to a son two days before the Italian invasion. Born in 1895, King Zog comes of a family who have ruled the tribal Mati district for genera-

tions. He is a slight fair man, good-looking and extremely pleasant to talk to. Since youth he has played a conspicuous part in his country's affairs, and rose to kingship by sheer ability; and though he may be criticised for failing to stamp out corruption among his officials, criticism must be tempered by an appreciation of his difficulties and of the great progress which the country made under his rule. Had there been less crass stupidity among chauvinist politicians in Yugoslavia it is doubtful whether he would have allowed Italy to gain so great a hold over his country; indeed, he tried several times to put a brake upon Italian penetration, rejecting a Customs Union in 1933 and in 1934 attempting to limit Italian control over official departments (for which official corruption, encouraged by the Italians themselves, was a pretext) until an Italian naval demonstration compelled him to modify his attitude. However, the Italians changed their tactics, making certain concessions which re-established between the two countries those friendly relations which thereafter existed until last March; then they suddenly demanded the appointment of Italian Under-Secretaries in all Albanian state departments, control of Albanian ports and air fields, and the right to garrison strategic points. Since Albania was threatened by nobody it is clear that the motives for these demands were aggressive—that the Italians wished to use Albania as their 'bridgehead,' from which they might invade or threaten to invade other Balkan countries; and when King Zog declined to connive at this plan the Italians pretended (as their pretext for invading his country) that he had asked for their assistance in an attack upon Yugoslavia—a contemptible inversion of the facts.

The rest of the story is fresh in everybody's memory. In total disregard of their agreements with or concerning Albania, of the Anglo-Italian Agreement, of Mussolini's personal pledges to Chamberlain, and of emphatic assurances by Count Ciano (so recently as April 4 and 5) that no action against Albania was contemplated, Italian troops, supported by a formidable concentration of warships and aircraft, were poured into the country. Though the British Government had been warned of what was impending, they had dispersed for Easter

and the Mediterranean Fleet was scattered. Resistance by the Albanians was hopeless, for the people were without arms and the army short of ammunition. King Zog and his Government followed Queen Geraldine into exile, an assembly of Albanian notables who had been jealous of King Zog offered the throne to the King of Italy, who accepted it, and a fresh Albanian Government was constituted to rule the country under an Italian Governor-General. The Italians have offered no plausible explanation of this outrage and the suggestion that unruly elements had endangered Italian lives falls flat because Italians were unmolested at their Legation during the invasion and the Italian Military Attaché moved freely in Tirana.

Albania, I have been repeatedly assured by Italian officials, is unsuitable for colonisation—and this is true because two-thirds of the country are mountainous, while the remainder, already well populated, is malarial. The exploitation of Albanian oil (in the Valona district) was already exclusively in Italian hands, likewise the development of other natural resources. Apart from these not very important resources, Italy's interest in Albania has been a matter of defensive strategy; and to secure that interest she had every possible guarantee and advantage short of actual sovereignty over the country.

General Pariani himself, a quiet man whose passion is his library at home, once explained Italy's strategic interest in Albania to me. Italy feared, he said, that Yugoslavia might—in alliance with a great Power hostile to Italy—invade Albania and occupy the vital coastline, throwing open the Bay of Valona to a hostile fleet. To guard against this eventuality Italy wished to train the Albanian Army so that it might hold prepared defensive lines until Italian troops could come to the Albanians' assistance. The chief landing-place would be Durazzo, from which roads radiated naturally to positions which must be held; moreover, Durazzo could be protected by Italian warships based upon Valona Bay, which was already dominated by Italian guns upon the strongly fortified Island of Saseno. This explanation was given to me while Italy's relations with Yugoslavia (which was then ruled by the staunchly Francophile King Alexander)

were dangerously uneasy; but in October 1934 King Alexander was assassinated at Marseilles, a Treaty of Friendship between Italy and Yugoslavia was concluded in March 1937, and any apprehensions which Italy might still have claimed to feel were allayed when her Axis partner, Germany, arrived upon Yugoslavia's northern border by overrunning Austria.

Italian troops in Northern Albania are now uncomfortably close to the great landlocked harbour of Kotor (Cattaro) in Yugoslavia. In the south, Italian heavy guns upon Albanian territory command the roadstead between the Island of Corfu and the Greek mainland—a roadstead which was of immense importance during the World War. In the east, Italian troops are half-way down the ancient Via Ægnatia, by which Roman legions marched from Durazzo to Salonika; and Salonika, where Yugoslavia has a Free Zone, is that country's only outlet to seas uncontrolled by Italy.

Yugoslavia is now almost completely encircled by the Axis Powers and by their secret partners Hungary and Bulgaria. It is a situation fraught with great danger, for incidents (pretexts for aggression) are easily engineered upon Balkan frontiers. Moreover, Italy may now constitute herself the protagonist of Albanian nationalist claims—claims which extend eastward to Vrania, Skoplje, and Veles in Yugoslavia and southward to the Gulf of Arta in Greece; they might be stretched, without overmuch imagination, to the Gulf of Salonika, and a common frontier between Albania and Bulgaria would be no new idea in Rome. Moreover, the Queen of Italy is a daughter of the late King Nicholas of Montenegro, and this might become the basis of an agitation for 'the liberation' of Montenegro from Yugoslavia. Croatia already demands autonomy, claiming Bosnia and Herzegovina, while Bulgaria and Hungary have territorial claims against Yugoslavia which they may revive when circumstances are propitious. So Yugoslavia's position is extremely parlous; but if she submits to the dictates of the Axis partners she may preserve her integrity and might be promised Salonika provided Free Zones were reserved there for them.

Apart from a dormant ambition to acquire Salonika, Yugoslavia has no territorial claims and shares with

Greece, Turkey, and Romania a desire to hold what she has—the fundamental idea of the Balkan Pact. She has weathered a series of internal crises which were due, in the main, to a clash between the Serbian chauvinists, who, inheriting rather crude conceptions of statecraft, wished to dominate the new kingdom, and the Croats, who, inheriting a superior culture from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, claim at least the same measure of autonomy that they enjoyed while under Hungarian rule (though they have no wish for a restoration of that rule). So dangerously chaotic did the situation become as a result of this internal struggle that in January 1929 King Alexander (Karageorgevitch) assumed absolute power; but a new Constitution, promulgated in September 1931, though leaving real power in the King's hands, provided for a gradual relaxation of centralised authority as the sense of national unity grew. There is little doubt that King Alexander was working towards decentralisation when he was assassinated in October 1934. Since his son Peter, who was at school in Surrey, was only eleven years old, three Regents were appointed to rule for him—the senior Regent being his uncle, Prince Paul.

Hitherto Italy had looked upon Yugoslavia as her rival in the Adriatic and had lost no opportunity of exploiting the differences between Serbs and Croats—but without much success, because these two branches of the same Slavonic family had in common a cordial dislike of Italy. In her intrigues Italy had been backed by Bulgaria and Hungary, and she had encouraged and subsidised both the Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (which existed in Bulgaria) and the so-called Croatian Revolutionary Organisation (Ustacha), which operated from Hungarian territory. It was the Ustacha which sent terrorists to Marseilles to assassinate King Alexander, but the actual assassin belonged to the (nominally) Macedonian Organisation and had been sent to instruct the Ustacha in terrorism; moreover, the crime, which had been suggested to Macedonian Revolutionaries at Rome in 1922, had often been considered in revolutionary circles in Bulgaria. King Alexander, 'Unifier of Yugoslavia,' was a firm friend of the Western Democracies and his removal greatly facilitated the plans of the Axis Powers. A propaganda campaign designed

to cast a shadow over Franco-Yugoslav relations followed the crime ; nevertheless the first reaction in Yugoslavia was a wave of violent indignation against Italy and Hungary, but this was soon and surprisingly outweighed by the economic advantages with which the Axis Powers induced Dr Stoyadinovitch's government to accept their friendship—the precarious friendship of the lion with the lamb.

The Internal Macedonian Revolutionary Organisation (I.M.R.O.), which played so large a part in Balkan history, had been founded in 1893 to free Macedonia from the Turks. But Tsar Ferdinand and his clique of Bulgarian chauvinists, basing their claims upon clever propaganda, planned to annex Macedonia and eventually succeeded, after a bitter struggle, in gaining control of this organisation. But during the Balkan Wars most of Macedonia was annexed by Serbia and Greece—Serbian Macedonia subsequently becoming part of Yugoslavia. Though Bulgaria shared defeat with the Central Powers in 1918, her chauvinists would not renounce their claims to Macedonia and the Greater Bulgaria of their dreams, and they soon agreed to collaborate with the Italians against Yugoslavia. The Revolutionary Organisation was revived, but its leaders showed reluctance to become the instruments of Bulgarian revisionism and Italian ambitions, so they were murdered and their places usurped by a group of terrorists headed by the notorious Ivan Mihailov. These terrorists had been recruited by Bulgarian army chiefs, and their first exploit was the murder of the Agrarian Prime Minister Stamboliski. Thereafter they became a secret Mafia at the service of the Bulgarian War Office, which was directed by General Volkov in close collaboration with King Boris. Their functions were twofold. In Yugoslavia they organised outrages to keep alive Yugoslav hostility towards Bulgaria; in Bulgaria they murdered or terrorised all who urged friendship with Yugoslavia or preached moderation. Among these moderates—who were invariably labelled 'Communists'—there were many who favoured some form of federation with Yugoslavia ; but such federation would have strengthened Yugoslavia against Italy and put an end to Bulgarian chauvinist dreams of Balkan hegemony, probably even led to the personal union

of the two countries under the native Karageorgevitch dynasty of Yugoslavia and the downfall of the Bulgarian Coburgs.

No foreign ruler has received in this country more favourable publicity than King Boris, and this is probably because he inherited from his father King Ferdinand what Dr Seton-Watson calls 'the specifically Magyar quality of self-advertisement in the foreign press, of throwing dust in the dazzled eyes of strangers.' Though less direct than his father, he has all his father's genius for intrigue and intolerance of criticism. His father continues to advise him from Germany, where he lives upon a pension granted to him for driving Bulgaria into the War upon the side of the Central Powers in 1915. His wife is a daughter of the King of Italy; their marriage in 1930 was enthusiastically hailed by the Bulgarian chauvinists as consolidating Italo-Bulgarian friendship, and Italy has declared more than once her interest in the preservation of the Bulgarian Dynasty.

The Bulgarian Constitution gave King Boris almost absolute powers and the right to conclude secret treaties without the consent of his people. In 1934 there had grown up a widespread conviction that he was binding Bulgaria to Italy and Germany; moreover, corruption and chaos among the political parties facilitated the control exercised by the Italophile army chiefs and their terrorist agents. Accordingly the Army, led by the retired Colonel Damian Veltchev, carried out a bloodless coup d'état in May 1934, purged the War Office (whereupon the terrorist organisation collapsed), and established a 'National' Government which planned to limit the king's powers and inaugurate a semi-corporative administration which would represent the people more truly than the sham parliament they suspended; these reformers leaned strongly towards the Western Democracies in foreign policy and believed—like Kemal Ataturk—in patriotism rather than irredentism. But royal intrigue, energetically seconded by the Italian, Hungarian, and German Legations, brought down this Government, and in April 1935 King Boris recovered his supreme power; he immediately appointed as Prime Minister a notoriously Germanophile chauvinist, and barely a month later Field-Marshal Goering arrived in

Sofia for secret conversations with him. Goering had been due in Sofia a year earlier, but Veltchev's coup d'état had caused him to postpone the visit.

Collaboration between agents of the revisionist Powers in the Balkans had long foreshadowed the Rome-Berlin Axis, nor did differences between Italy and Germany over Austria ever seem so incapable of adjustment that they would prevent Italo-German co-operation for the realisation of their vast schemes of diverging expansion. However, Goering's visit to Sofia did mark Bulgaria's change of course from an Italian policy having German sympathy to an Italo-German policy (which Veltchev had tried to frustrate), and its first result was a speeding-up of Bulgaria's clandestine rearmament (which was well advanced before the Balkan Entente Powers bought Bulgaria's adherence to a Treaty of Friendship with them in July 1938 by consenting to it); moreover, mysterious works were begun at Bulgaria's smaller Black Sea ports.

The Bulgarian people are worthy and peace-loving, but there is every sign that their chauvinist rulers are preparing once again to plunge them into unwanted war at Germany's behest while stifling them by one of the most drastic censorships in Europe. Germany has been allowed to gain a complete economic stranglehold (taking 75 per cent. of Bulgaria's exports), while the comings and goings of Bulgarian and German officials and experts are signs of what is preparing. Bulgaria is destined by the Axis Powers to become the spear-head of their ambitions. But in 1935 Bulgaria was isolated. Declining to renounce her revisionist claims against her neighbours she had refused to join the Balkan Entente, so her neighbours had concluded the Balkan Pact without her (in February 1934), adding secret protocols which provided for joint military action against her if she continued to harbour raiding terrorist bands. Hitherto, under Italian guidance, her revisionist campaign had been concentrated almost exclusively against Yugoslavia; but Italo-German collaboration for wider aims reversed that policy. At a word from Rome sworn foes became sworn friends and on Jan. 24, 1937, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia signed a treaty of 'perpetual' friendship. Two months later Italy concluded with Yugoslavia treaties

of friendship and commerce which guaranteed Yugoslavia's frontiers and gave her substantial economic advantages, while Italy obtained Yugoslav recognition of her stranglehold over Albania and a promise of Yugoslav neutrality in any conflict in which Italy is engaged. Thus Italy made herself secure in the Adriatic, assured for herself and Germany an important source of supply for foodstuffs and minerals, and established a friendly link with Bulgaria; nor is it probable that Yugoslavia would be strong enough to refuse the transit of war materials and even troops across her territory to Bulgaria in the event of war, for she is held in the Axis vice.

Bulgaria is dangerous because her chauvinist rulers are obsessed with megalomaniac ambitions. These ambitions extend to Prizren and the Albanian frontier with Yugoslavia, to Florina, Salonika, and the whole of Greek Thrace, to Constantza and even into Romanian Bessarabia, and to Rodosto, Gallipoli, and even to Istanbul itself. Under King Ferdinand they attempted to realise these unjustifiable ambitions and under King Boris they have nursed a grievance because they failed; and if they have now forsworn (for the time being) their claims against Yugoslavia, it is in anticipation of substantial gains elsewhere. In 1912 they won an Ægean seaboard, but lost it again by joining the Central Powers in 1915, but they have repeatedly refused an economic outlet through Dedeagatch or Salonika, insisting always that nothing less than a territorial outlet will content them. The Southern Dobrudja they lost to Romania when they treacherously attacked their Serbian allies in 1913, but the offer of its restoration to them did not deter them from attacking Romania in 1916; yet now they protest that if it was restored to them their differences with Romania would be at an end, but this is a manoeuvre to shorten the Romanian coastline and approach Constantza. Nor can it be supposed that any agreements or treaties would bind them when greater Powers do not hesitate to repudiate their most solemn undertakings.

As in Germany and Italy, so in Bulgaria the ruling caste has created precedents by which she is judged, and her diplomatic history is a record of subterfuges which her best elements deplore. When the World War began in 1914 she declared herself neutral, but martial law and

a strict censorship were imposed and King Ferdinand secretly pledged himself to support the Central Powers at an opportune moment; then bands of irregulars directed by the General Staff and financed by the Austro-Hungarian Legation in Sofia repeatedly attempted to destroy the railway upon which the Serbs depended for supplies from their allies through Salonika, while the secret help she gave to Turkey largely contributed to our failure at Gallipoli and thus prolonged the War. Meantime the Opposition leaders were arrested and a 'Volunteer Division' of 34,000 picked fanatics raised to crush any popular opposition to mobilisation; yet even while mobilisation was proceeding the Bulgarian Government continued to pretend that the country would remain neutral. The representatives of the Entente Powers had lost opportunities of encouraging their friends in Bulgaria and it is to be feared that similar opportunities were thrown away in 1934 and 1935, so Bulgaria may play again a part greatly to our disadvantage unless revolution drives from power the small minority of chauvinists who control her destinies.

Romania is threatened by Bulgaria and by Hungary—Hungary claims Transylvania, which Romania acquired by the World War (thereby doubling her size), while Bulgaria's claims against her have been mentioned already. With the disappearance of Czechoslovakia (which brought Germany into contact with Poland's Ukrainian lands) Romania found herself in a precarious position, because Germany may count upon Hungarian collaboration against her. In Transylvania there are 1,500,000 Magyars and 750,000 Germans, in Bessarabia 500,000 Ukrainians, and in the Southern Dobrudja 250,000 Bulgarians, and it would not be hard to organise among any of them incidents which would afford pretexts for further forcible 'revision'; however, King Carol has dealt wisely with these minorities, allowing them wide liberties and the right to carry on their own social and cultural activities, nor are the Magyar peasants anxious to pass again under the semi-feudal sway of their former Hungarian landlords.

By his political astuteness and resolution King Carol has become, since he returned to Romania in 1930, the most powerful man in his country, causing prudish

critics of his early escapades to revise their opinions. One day in 1931 he received me in the tiny study of the modest villa he preferred to his palaces; he gave an impression of energy and sound common sense, qualities which have assisted him to overcome the Germanophile Iron Guard and insert a stiff spinal column into a nation which has often been accused of corruption and 'spinelessness.' Romania's agricultural, mineral, and timber resources are coveted by Germany, but Germany's 'economic ultimatum' last March, whereby a monopoly of Romania's foreign trade and a suppression of industries competing with Germany's were demanded, was successfully resisted (though extensive but legitimate and not exclusive advantages were accorded to Germany).

The fulfilment of Britain's pledge to support Romania if she should be attacked depends upon Turkish co-operation, and this has been secured by the recent Anglo-Turkish Agreement. Turkey controls the Dardanelles and Bosphorus, and acquired, by the Montreux Convention in 1936, the right to refortify these straits and to use her discretion with regard to the passage through them of warships in time of war; moreover, the size and number of foreign warships which may pass the straits in peace-time is strictly limited. But by the Anglo-Turkish Agreement—which is, in fact, a defensive alliance—both countries revert to their traditional policy of co-operation which is based upon their common desire to prevent the straits from falling into the hands of an aggressive third Power. Furthermore, Turkey's very appreciable army supplements British naval strength and Turkey's ample harbours are more than adequate for any British naval requirements in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The rise of the new and virile Turkish Republic from the ruins of the 'ramshackle Empire' is among the most spectacular developments of the last twenty years. Under her late dictator, Kemal Ataturk, she cut the losses of the World War, drove the Greeks from her soil in 1922, discarded the moth-eaten robes of the old order, arrayed herself in the trappings of the West by a series of conspicuously successful reforms, and earned the unreserved sympathy of all nations with peaceful intentions by her scrupulous respect for international undertakings.

General Ismet Inonu, who succeeded Atatürk at the end of last year, pledged himself to continue his predecessor's work, and the future of Turkey causes no anxiety to her friends.

While the isolation and dismemberment of Yugoslavia was Italy's primary aim she had promoted Greco-Turkish understanding, but this understanding bore fruit without her by the conclusion of the Greco-Turkish Treaty of Mutual Guarantee in September 1933. Turkey, rich and under-populated, cannot forget that during the World War Italy claimed Southern Anatolia and Smyrna, holds the Dodecanese islands (off the Turkish coast), and has a base at Rhodes. Therefore, though the Greco-Turkish Treaty was concluded primarily to restrain Bulgarian aggressiveness (of which the construction of railways and roads through the Rhodope Mountains to the Greek border were interpreted as signs) and though Bulgaria was reminded of it when she was tempted to take advantage of the Greek military rebellion in March 1935, this treaty was directed, in effect, against Italian intentions, for Bulgaria's revisionist plans were based upon the assumption that Italy would co-operate with her—hence the significance of the words I have quoted at the beginning of this article. She is now assured, too, of German co-operation; and it is intended, by the Axis Powers, that she shall become the spear-head of their thrust to the Dardanelles.

From Florina, close to the Albanian border, a Greek railway follows the ancient Via Ægnatia to Salonika and thence to the Turkish frontier; it would be difficult for Greece to defend this route against a combined attack by Italy and Bulgaria, for between Salonika and Dedeagatch her territory is too narrow and too mountainous for security, while the country between Florina and Salonika favours Italian mechanised superiority. Therefore a combined attack upon Greece would quickly bring Italo-Bulgarian armies to the lower Maritza, only forty miles from the Dardanelles. Turkish fortifications in Eastern Thrace are formidable, but whether sufficiently formidable to resist the combined might of Italy, Germany, and Bulgaria only war can decide. In any case the situation would be uncomfortably precarious.

Greece has been exposed to an intensive German (and

to a lesser extent Italian) propaganda campaign, while economic bonds with Germany and the Axis Powers' successes have weakened British prestige; nevertheless the Greeks cannot be oblivious of the danger which is constituted by the presence of overwhelming Italian forces in Albania, nor ignore the three-pronged threat of the *Drang nach Osten*, the *Via Egnatia*, and Bulgarian claims to an *Ægean* seaboard. The Franco-British pledge of April 13, which revived old allegiances based upon affection for French culture and respect for British sea-power, was, therefore, welcomed in Greece, and Anglo-French naval power may count the Greek harbours among its assets in the Eastern Mediterranean (if they can be defended against attack from Albania). The Anglo-Turkish Agreement is an additional bond.

Greece is now governed upon Fascist lines by her Dictator, General Metaxas, who seized power in August 1936, nine months after the restoration of the monarchy. That King George connived at the abolition of democratic government certainly does not indicate that his sympathies are Fascist or Italophile; on the contrary, there is much evidence that they lie with Great Britain and that his instincts are very democratic—indeed, within a week of his restoration he stirred enthusiasm among the Republicans and corresponding indignation among the Royalists by refusing to countenance the repressive measures the latter urged. In private conversation this cheerful and good-natured man told me he wanted 'to make a good job of being King' but found his task extremely difficult because so many politicians seemed incapable of setting national welfare before their petty personal interests; and that, no doubt, is why he agreed to a dictatorship—though he remains a moderating influence tempering General Metaxas' ruthlessness.

To sum up, it will be seen that there is in progress in the Balkans a tug-of-war between land-power and sea-power for strategic advantage. The Axis Powers have in their favour their economic requirements and their military strength—the former enable them to offer inducements in the form of commercial advantages and the latter provide means of pressure. Moreover, they need the natural resources of the Balkans in any future war. Their position is strong, for they have the strategic advantage of

'interior lines'—the strength of the Central Powers during the last World War. Already they are a barrier across Europe which can be passed only by sea; now they are working to secure an overland route, through Yugoslavia, into Bulgaria, and thence towards the Dardanelles. Should the Dardanelles fall into their hands the Black Sea would be closed by them, Romania would be isolated from Great Britain and France, the highways into the Ukrainian Republic and into Asia would lie before them— dangers the Russian Government is negotiating with Great Britain to meet. Indeed, it may be said that the keys to Asia and to Africa lie in the Balkan Peninsula.

J. SWIRE.

Art. 9.—THE LETTERS OF GEORGE IV.

The Letters of George IV. Edited by A. Aspinall.
With an introduction by C. K. Webster. Cambridge
University Press, 1939.

THE period covered by the eight years of unrestricted Regency, from 1812 to 1820, and the ten years following to 1830, is as rich in political incident as it is in literary achievement. When it opens, Wellington, with Ciudad Rodrigo taken, is planning the campaign of Salamanca; Napoleon is mustering his forces for the invasion of Russia over the body of a submissive Prussia; Scott is shrewdly calculating the effect of 'Childe Harold' on his own poetic vogue, and thinking of new fields in which to propagate his fame and establish his fortune. Pass over three years. Napoleon is at St Helena; the Congress of Vienna is sitting; the authors, known and unknown, of the 'Giaour' and 'Waverley' divide between them the attention of all Britain. Then come the years of trouble: the winding up of the war and the collapse of war-prices and war-prosperity; the increasing burden of the Poor Law; years of apprehension and disaffection, of slow recovery and disastrous set-backs; England simmering, Ireland boiling, with sedition. Years of gradual disentanglement from the complexities of European policy; of stubborn resistance to the forces of reform, and sudden collapse; years that end with the death of the King and the utter overthrow of the long-sustained Tory ascendancy; with the opening of a new age, which very soon appeared to be not so different after all from the old age. Years of heroic effort in field and council, of Wellington and Castle-reagh; of murk, squalor, and corruption, for they are the years of the Royal Divorce; of a press debased and sordid beyond belief; and not less the years of our most glowing romance, our most aspiring poetry; an age unrestrained, exuberant, violent, rising and falling with swiftness unaccountable to the heights of public virtue and individual genius, and the depths of individual depravity and public imbecility. A Roman of the last age of the Republic would have found himself at home in Georgian England. There it is, among the Metelli and the Lentuli, in the company of Curio and M. Coelius and

their freedmen and their gang-leaders, that we must look for the analogues of the Regency nobles, their journalists, and their election agents. Ruthless and sentimental, ambitious and querulous, magnificent and base—men of whom we cannot say whether they will end as ruined gamblers in a foreign spa or as conquerors in unknown lands, like Francis Marquess of Hastings: whether they will spend their lives receiving the homage of dependants in their own countryside or some day rise at the call of their country, as statesmen and legislators, like Charles Earl Grey, whose voice will move the assent of millions.

All this turbulence, in all its shades and degrees, is mirrored in the correspondence now published with the consent of H.M. King George V. When in 1812 the appointment of a Private Secretary to the Regent and all the constitutional issues thereto annexed were discussed in the House of Commons, the Government tactfully and discreetly argued that few sovereigns could be expected to possess the business habits of George III. Certainly George IV did not; and this collection is evidence that the most industrious and devoted of Private Secretaries could not keep pace with the accumulating disorder of the royal closet. Here are all the indicia of an office in disarray: dunning letters twenty years old, enclosures not enclosed, and replies that answer nothing. Some years after the death of the Princess Charlotte, Scott was startled to find that all her early correspondence had been passed to Terry the actor by a man unknown, who—it may be guessed—had received it from a dishonest servant. In 1835 a boxful of the King's letters were sold to 'a man named Jackson who lived in Shoe Lane,' and who very honourably restored them. Another set was discovered by Princess Henry of Battenberg among Queen Victoria's papers. 'It has always been a mystery,' Lord Esher wrote on that occasion, 'where the letters of George III, George IV, and William IV disappeared to; but it is possible that as these have turned up, others may follow.'

It is not likely that any future discovery will greatly modify the world's idea of George IV or its judgment on the public transactions of his regency and reign. The story opens in 1812 with a sudden, unexpected breach between the Regent and his old friends the Whigs.

They had every reason to suppose that as soon as the restrictions on the Regency expired, that is on Feb. 18, 1812, the Perceval administration would be dismissed and Grenville or Grey sent for. But the Regent's own views of foreign and domestic policy had changed. He had drawn back from Catholic Emancipation, to which his earlier associations inclined him, his pledges bound him. He was not prepared, with Grenville, to abandon the Peninsula. He did not, like Grey, regard the war with the French Empire and Napoleon as a hopeless struggle against inevitable defeat. To the Cabinet he wrote :

' A new era is now arrived : and the Prince Regent cannot but reflect with satisfaction on the events which have distinguished his short administration. Instead of suffering in the loss of any of its possessions by the gigantic force which has been employed against them, Great Britain has added most important acquisitions to her Empire ; the national faith has been preserved inviolate towards our Allies, and, if character is strength as applied to a nation, the increased and increasing reputation of His Majesty's arms will show to the nations of the Continent how much they may still achieve by inferior numbers when animated by a glorious spirit of resistance to a foreign yoke. In the critical situation of the war in the Peninsula, the P.R. will be most anxious to avoid every measure which can lead his Allies to suppose that he means to depart from the present system : perseverance alone can achieve the great object in question, and he cannot mark with disapprobation those who have honourably distinguished themselves in support of it.

' Having made this communication of his sentiments on the new and extraordinary crisis of our affairs, the Prince Regent cannot conclude without expressing the gratification he shall feel if those persons with whom the early habits of his public life were found, will strengthen his hands, and constitute a part of his administration. With such support, and such a vigorous and united Government, he will never despair of a fortunate issue to the most arduous contest in which Great Britain were ever engaged.'

This overture to the Whigs was duly made by means of the Duke of York. It was not accepted ; and Perceval was confirmed in his office as Premier.

Wellesley broke into open revolt. He had been Foreign Secretary for three years, and, only a month

before, had offered his resignation on the grounds that his brother was being inadequately supported in Spain and that Perceval was not fit to be Prime Minister. But now he was not content with resigning ; he approached the Regent with a new project or combination : Moira to be Prime Minister, Catholic Emancipation to be an open question, places to be found for Canning and Castlereagh. The Regent, quite properly, referred this advice to Ministers ; and as Ministers, very naturally, replied that they could not serve with a colleague who was Cabinet-making behind their backs, Wellesley had to go.

It may be questioned whether Grey and Grenville were right in declining to join the Government. There is no doubt that their decision was approved by their party ; and the dismay of the Whigs at the Regent's volte-face was inflamed by every topic of personal disappointment and public anxiety. The Duke of Bedford foresaw the loss of Ireland if the hopes which the Catholics had been allowed to entertain were not fulfilled. So, though his opinion counted for less, did the Duke of Norfolk. Moira, one of the oldest and most devoted of the Regent's friends, refused the consolation of the Garter ; and Lady Moira took to her bed in hysterical alarm lest he should be forced to accept it. His nephew, A.D.C. to the Regent, cut the royal buttons off his coat and vowed never to wear the badge of servitude again. Lauderdale, another old friend, took the Regent's after-dinner tirade against the Whigs as a personal insult and stalked out of Carlton House, leaving the company in consternation and the Princess Charlotte in tears.

- ' Weep, Daughter of a royal line,
A Sire's disgrace, or nature's decay :
Ah ! happy if each tear of thine
Could wash a Father's fault away !
- ' Weep, for thy tears are Virtue's tears,
Auspicious to these suffering Isles ;
And be each drop in future years
Repaid thee by thy People's smiles ! '

On May 11 Perceval was shot in the Lobby by a man with a grievance against the Foreign Office : and everything was in the melting-spot once more. Ten days later, somewhat to his own surprise, Stuart Wortley

carried an address praying the Regent 'to take such measures as would enable him, under the present circumstances of the Country, to form a strong and efficient Ministry,' a motion which the Government rightly treated as a vote of censure. Wellesley, this time with the Royal Commission, renewed his negotiations. Besides the Whigs round Grey and Grenville, whose hostility to any project not likely to put them in control was inveterate, there were two groups to be considered, the Peninsular party, as they may be called, who wanted a more vigorous prosecution of the war, and the Catholic party, who stood for justice to Ireland and the redemption of pledges undoubtedly given. But it soon became clear that no basis of union could be found. None of the old administration would serve under Wellesley. Many of them would not consent even to enquire into the Catholic claims; and when the negotiations were transferred to Moira—he had been easily reconciled, he had accepted his Garter and his nephew had resumed his buttons—a fresh and insuperable difficulty emerged. The Whigs insisted on changes in the Household, in particular that Yarmouth—Thackeray's Steyne and Disraeli's Monmouth—should cease to be Vice-Chamberlain. And as all London believed that his mother was the Regent's mistress, Moira could not in decency allow the demand. The Government was re-formed under Lord Liverpool, and a last attempt to broaden its basis was foiled by the pretensions of Canning. He demanded the leadership of the Commons, an office to which his eloquence and superb debating power undoubtedly entitled him. The Regent personally entreated Castlereagh to forgo his claims and, left to himself, Castlereagh might have yielded. But not less invincible was the determination of his party to keep Canning down. So it was Castlereagh, not Canning, who organised the last alliance against Napoleon, and Castlereagh who went to Vienna.

For a few days the Premiership had floated before the eyes of Moira. Now, with an anti-Catholic Government firmly installed in England, even the prospect of Dublin Castle was fading. Sadly and seriously he resigned himself to the foreign exile which his own extravagance and the Regent's unwillingness, or inability, to repay his advances had condemned him. An able and even brilliant

soldier, trained in the American War, he was now at fifty-six a ruined man without a future. But the Regent was determined to save him. In September rumours ran round London that he was destined for India. They were true. The Court of Directors took some persuading, but they were persuaded; and on Nov. 18 the Private Secretary was able to report that Moira was Governor-General and Napoleon in retreat from Moscow. So auspiciously did his career open; and if it ended under a censure, not wholly merited, yet history has placed him with Clive and Dalhousie among the great rulers of India. He delivered Oudh from the Gurkhas; he broke the Mahrattas; he won Singapore for the Empire.

Moira sailed in April 1813, and few things in these volumes are more characteristic of the age than the letter to the Regent's Private Secretary in which he expostulates against the Admiralty order that the 'Stirling Castle,' line of battleship, in which he was to make the voyage, should also act as convoy to the Indiamen round the Cape.

'This addition may be three or four weeks augmentation to the length of the voyage. I feel this for Lady Loudoun (his wife); I feel it for the Prince. It was the profession of His Royal Highness that I should go out in that dignified style which should rebut the popular imputation that he was only studying to get rid of me, and which should testify that he still condescended to feel an interest for me. . . . Indeed, indeed, this is not decorous. I speak not as to myself but as to the testimony which the Prince wished to give of his earnestness to make this mission creditable to me.'

That the Sea-Lords, with all the ocean-routes to watch, the remnants of the French Fleet still to be blockaded, the ravages of privateers to be kept down, and the unexpectedly powerful American frigates now on their hands, may not have had a line of battleship to spare does not seem to have passed through the Proconsul's mind: he could only 'suppose that the kind dispositions' of Lord Melville had been 'frittered away through intrigues of the Board.' But in a society so small, so vigilant, and so competitive as that of Georgian England, a slight or the remotest appearance of what malevolence might report as a slight was felt with keen and almost feminine resentment. The reader of these volumes soon learns to recognise every accent of wounded honour; to

appreciate with what pertinacity and what subservience great nobles allowed themselves to court officials whom they hated personally and despised socially; whether the object in end was another star or another step for themselves, a post at court for a relation, a sinecure for an old friend, a job in the Treasury for a young one; what anguish charges their pen when the long-deferred Garter is still deferred; what bitter tears old warriors can shed when the anticipated baronetcy turns out to be a G.C.B. For the successful the rewards were lavish: honours from the Crown, grants from Parliament, or, for Indian services, from the Company. The four sons of Lord Mornington got between them one dukedom, two marquessates, and a barony; and from Wade's Black Book, the manual of Radical Reformers in 1830, it appeared that, while receiving altogether some 40,000*l.* a year in public money, they frugally permitted their mother to be provided for by a pension of 800*l.* on the Civil List. Little wonder that to a stream which flowed so freely old friends of the Prince and lifelong supporters of his Government thought themselves not less entitled, in proportion to their services, to have recourse.

Three Private Secretaries in turn controlled the Regent's correspondence. The appointment of Colonel Macmahon, an honest soldier without remarkable abilities or aristocratic connections, occasioned the discussion already referred to, when the Whigs posed the unanswerable dilemma—either the Private Secretary is a Privy Councillor or he is not; if he is not, he ought not to know Cabinet secrets; if he is, he is bound by oath to declare to the King his own opinion, and so, in effect, to censor that of Ministers; and Castlereagh rejoined, not less unanswerably, that the Regent must have someone to look after his papers. Macmahon had drunk himself to death by 1817, and was succeeded by Sir Benjamin Bloomfield, who as an impoverished captain of horse artillery had attracted the Prince's notice by his singing at the Pavilion. Bloomfield lasted till 1822, when, his temper having given way, he was pensioned off on the diplomatic service as Minister in Stockholm, becoming on his own account a Wesleyan and by the grace of his sovereign Lord Bloomfield of Tipperary. The third was Sir William Knighton, a man much maligned.

The style of the Regent, when he takes pen in hand himself, is curiously effusive and wayward : often not without dignity, but lacking in pungency and humour ; and overflowing with a demonstrative affection, not out of place when he is writing to his family, which in his later years, and in his correspondence with Knighton, sometimes becomes intolerably maudlin. On a general review, the reader will not find it difficult to understand Wellington's verdict on him, 'the strangest mixture of good qualities and bad, but on the whole the good predominating' ; and may even seek to distinguish between the natural temper of the man and the distortions to which it had been subjected by an unwise and unhappy education, by idleness and bad company, by flattery ministering to self-will, perhaps by disappointed affection. He was genuinely attached to his mother and sisters, and handled his rather difficult batch of brothers with sense and kindness. There are the makings in him too of an able and conscientious sovereign : not obstinate in small matters, not facile in things of consequence ; dealing honestly by his Ministers ; not overstepping his limits. But they are the makings only : there is no such persistency as made his father and his niece, neither of whom possessed his natural capacity, experts in public business ; there is no coherence of ideas, no sense of duty : in a word, no character—only a kaleidoscopic shift of many characters, all coming more and more, in the middle period of the years which these volumes cover, to be dominated by one emotion, one desire : hatred of the Princess and the resolve to be free of her.

By breaking with the Whigs the Regent had exposed himself to every blast of Radical invective, and his relations with his wife gave his assailants a field of action where they could operate without restraint. In August 1818 the fateful commission 'by command of H.R.H. the Prince Regent and with the approbation of the Lord High Chancellor and the Earl of Liverpool' was issued to William Cooke, K.C., Major Browne, and John Allan Powell, to proceed to Milan 'and thence to all other places at your discretion for the purpose of making enquiries into the conduct of H.R.H. the Princess of Wales since she quitted England in the month of August 1814.' As the Royal Divorce did not issue in a revolution, as the

Crown was not submerged in a universal wave of disgust, the hand that set this sordid business in motion has been forgotten. In 1815 John Leach, an elderly and ambitious K.C. who aspired, without much success, to combine the characters of a lawyer and a buck, had won the regard of the Regent by opposing in the Commons a motion for enquiry into his expenditure. He became his confidential adviser, Chancellor of the Duchy of Cornwall, and in due course Vice-Chancellor of England. It was in this capacity that he launched the Milan Commission on its obscene career.

Of Caroline herself nothing needs to be said: as Professor Webster rightly acknowledges, the evidence now produced shows that she was 'unfit for decent human relations.' There can be no doubt that she did hope to pass off the boy William Austin as the Prince's son, and therefore heir to the throne, no doubt that as a step in this direction she tried to compromise her daughter with a young officer in attendance at Windsor. In 1814:

'The Princess Charlotte (she was then eighteen) confessed to her father she had private interviews with him with the Princess of Wales' knowledge and connivance, as the Princess used to let him into her own apartment by a door that opened into Kensington Gardens, and then left them together in her own bedroom, and turned the key upon them, saying "A présent je vous laisse: amusez vous."'

Charlotte was by no means incapable of taking care of herself: we know enough of her to see that, in courage and determination, she was of the same stock as her cousin Victoria. But by itself this story is enough to account for the disgust, almost amounting to horror, with which the Prince, who was very fond of his daughter, regarded his wife. On the other hand, it is not to be denied that the means he took to free himself—he being what he was—were in the highest degree imprudent, and for that imprudence Liverpool and Eldon must share the blame.

It was the misfortune of the Regent, and the King, that his ministers were not his friends and his friends, after 1812, could hardly hope to be his ministers. He liked able men—it is one of his better qualities—as he liked good books and handsome buildings. But with Moira in India, Sheridan sinking lower and lower into

debt and drink, and Erskine in retirement, there was no one at hand, no one of rank and authority, to whom he could confide his troubles and who could have advised him for his own good. On the other hand, all the proceedings of the Milan Commission were known to the Princess and her friends. James Brougham was on the spot, reporting to his brother Henry on her style of living, her debts, the personnel of her squalid court. He at least had no doubts, and out of the situation as he saw it he had high hopes of doing a good turn to the House of Hanover, and not a bad one to the House of Brougham.

She was then living at Pesaro, in relations hardly ambiguous, with Pergami, her Italian chamberlain.

'Never was anything so obvious. The whole thing was apparent to everyone, tho' perhaps there might be difficulty in proving the fact to find her guilty of high treason, yet I should think all the circumstances being stated would completely ruin her in the opinion of the people of England; that once done, the P. might get divorce, or at any rate prevent her becoming Queen if she (? he) wished it.

'You are a better judge. But I cannot see much good to be gained by keeping things as they are. Your being of her side, and also most of the Opposition, may make them more obnoxious to the P., and unless any great good were to be got by it, why not make a merit of it, make a good bargain for her as to money, and come to terms about a divorce or separation with the P.? I do assure you she seriously wishes for this. She said she would take 100,000*l.* and give up her annuity and everything. This of course would be madness, not three years' income! but she does not know the value of money. *We* can arrange all that and the more she gets the more she will be obliged to you and me.'

Certainly, Henry Brougham had the advantage of knowing the worst that could be said of his future client, and James Brougham's simple device for settling the affair was really as sensible as could be contrived. Let the Princess assert her innocence, deprecate 'these inquisitions,' and say that as, after the death of her daughter, there was no pleasure for her in England, she desired a separation. In return, her debts might be paid, and also 'the expenses of this business,' and with an annuity of 25,000*l.* a year, she could live in comfort and have 'the odd 5000' for annuities—and gratuities—in

England, Henry and James Brougham doubtless not being forgotten. Henry passed it on to Lord Hutchinson, but the Prince would not listen. He insisted on a divorce, so that—professedly—he might, at fifty-six, be free to marry again. In truth, his outraged feelings—as father and sovereign rather than as husband—wanted revenge. But so did the discomfited Whig battalions. And what might happen to the Crown when issue was joined was a matter to which both parties were as indifferent as the Princess herself.

Yet never, since the accession of the House of Hanover, had there been a time when the Monarchy needed to be more carefully guarded or when disaffection was more widely diffused. The elections of 1818 had given the Government a substantial but by no means stable majority; 1819 is the year of Burdett's motion—anticipating the Chartists—for annual Parliaments, universal suffrage, and the ballot; of Peterloo and the Six Acts; in 1820 the old King died, and the new reign opened with Thistlewood's desperate conspiracy to murder the Cabinet. At almost any cost the matter of the divorce ought to have been evaded or postponed, and so the Government saw. Had any alternative administration been available, the King would undoubtedly have dismissed Lord Liverpool and sought help elsewhere. But there was none. And there were those who had resolved that the issue should not be evaded. On Feb. 21, Joseph Hume, the Radical, rose to complain that no financial provision has been made for the Queen and that her name had been omitted from the Liturgy. Brougham's compromise, already rejected by the King, no longer appealed to Caroline. In England she was sure of supporters: and if the King persisted with the divorce, she knew she could overwhelm him with recriminatory evidence. 'We have,' wrote Hutchinson, 'been entirely outgeneralled: the violence and the determination of this woman have had for the moment the effect of wisdom and arrangement, and she has completely succeeded in all her plans.' And as if this were not enough for a suffering monarch, the Cabinet had to tell him plainly that his Civil List could not be increased, and that, in spite of the Pavilion and the Coronation, he would have to keep his expenses within the settlement of 1816.

It was during these agitations that Sir William Knighton established that ascendancy over the mind of the King which he held to the last, and which exposed him to such bitter jealousy and ill will. A country doctor by origin, Knighton at thirty had a good West End practice, and in a few years was a baronet and the Prince's favourite physician. 'Knighton,' he said, 'is the best-mannered doctor I ever met.' Besides good manners, he possessed a considerable skill in business, and to his dexterity George owed his extrication from the burden and confusion of his debts and some mitigation at least of the venomous mischief of Harriette Wilson. The King, in fact, whose health was finally broken by an almost fatal illness at the time of his accession, came to be as dependent on his faithful secretary as a sick child on his nurse, and at his worst moments, we learn from Greville, to hate him as savagely. At the crisis of the divorce proceedings, in November 1820, when Liverpool had decided that, in face of the feeling in Parliament and the country, the Bill of Pains and Penalties could not proceed, the King thus committed his thoughts to paper, and to Knighton :

'Every opposition promise, when out of office, what they never can fulfil in power. The known principles of the present Opposition may be designated under the term *Libéraux*. How are they to be met, for example, if they propose the liberation of Bonaparte? How are they to be met, should they propose to change the system and spirit of my foreign policy—a policy, the successful application of which, has brought back everything to this country, and establish a power and friendship with the sovereigns and governments of Europe, that England never before possessed?

'How am I to meet any proposals that shall rip up this confidence and destroy the wise fabric, the happy foundation of which, I am authorised to say, I have laid during my Regency?

'How are they to be met if they propose the emancipation of the Catholics, a measure entirely opposite to my own conscientious feelings, and which has been strengthened, if I may use the expression, by the pure and exalted spirit of my ever-revered father, and who I may say deprived himself of his reason in the struggle between the duties of his own conscience, in opposition to these very people? If I am called upon to yield to such a proposition, and should yield, would it not be a complete abandonment of character?

'Finally, in parting with the old Government of nearly ten years' standing, I feel that on many occasions they might have consulted my feelings more, and to have added to my happiness, nay, that they have sacrificed both, but they have been a good Government to the country, and during their administration I cannot forget the vindictive persecutions, the lowering abuse to my character, the wanton aspersions upon all those principles most sacred and dear to me, in short whatever of estimation I may have lost among my subjects, the nucleus, the foundation, and the continuance up to the present hour, I may justly date to them (i.e. the Opposition) : with this before me how can I dismiss from my mind that the hour may not arrive, when a renewal of past feelings may not break forth, and I may be exposed to the horror and inconvenience of being shut out on all sides from any set of men, or servants, that can make my life tolerable.

'These also I submit for thy dear consideration, but will do whatever you will desire.'

No single document in this collection throws such light on the working of George's mind. Everything is here : his high sense of his standing as a European sovereign, a king among kings ; his pride in the overthrow of Napoleon—and, after all, he had some ground for pride, because if he had dismissed the Tories in 1812 the Grand Alliance would not have been formed and the Peninsula would have been abandoned ; when the Allies entered Paris in 1814 he wrote to his mother : 'I trust you will think I have done my duty at last, and perhaps I may be vain enough to hope that you will be a little proud of *your son*.' Here too is that astonishing capacity for self-deception, which enabled him to think of himself as the loyal and reverent child of that parent whose life he had made miserable, whose infirmities he had parodied among his friends. And the rambling, drunken self-pity of the last paragraph—the syntax growing more chaotic with each refreshing glass of curaçao—still has in it some gleams of public spirit : 'They have been a good Government to the country.'

They were in fact the only possible Government. Lord Lansdowne, who had already won the position of general consultant in Ministerial crises which he was to hold for more than forty years, could see no alternative. Holland would do nothing without Grey ; Buckingham was ready 'to set off instantly in a chaise and four for Lord Grenville's if that would be deemed of any service,'

but was quite clear that any application to Holland House meant ruin to the King. So the Liverpool administration stayed on, and the King resigned himself to his fate, in a moral effusion which it must have given him great pleasure to pen :

'Inter tanta nau fragia, what remains is for me to decide upon. Nothing but a determination to persevere, a thorough trust in Providence, a good conscience, a high principle and sentiment of honour, and a firmness of action in decision arising from the true sense of the justice of my cause, and consequently the conviction that yielding in the smallest particular or instance would be *instant perdition to me* ; by which I mean not only loss of character and honour to *me* (which is *dearer* than life) but loss also of all political and moral weight, influence, and authority to the Crown, for ever.'

Ernest, Duke of Cumberland, was also in a homiletic mood. 'The most vital part of the country,' he wrote, 'is the morals of the Realm'—a topic on which public opinion regarded him as even less qualified to speak than his brother. But on the whole he was glad that the Bill had been dropped, because had it reached the Commons there would have been 'most horrid scenes.' The Government had calculated, rightly as the event proved, that the London mob would soon grow tired of its toy, and that if only they could prevent the King from exposing himself, the agitation would subside, the Queen be forgotten. Sidmouth, who, as the Duke of Wellington said, brought more public opinion into the Cabinet than any other member, noticed with satisfaction that feeling in the country was turning towards the King.

Just at this moment, Dr Dodsworth, Canon of Windsor, died. The Conyngham family wanted the stall for a protégé of their own, a Hampshire curate named Sumner, and the King, who liked him personally, agreed. Liverpool, who was most scrupulous in his ecclesiastical appointments, demurred, and a Ministerial crisis ensued. Castlereagh took the gravest view of the consequences if the King persisted : Sidmouth pointed out that the 'motives and causes which had occasioned the appointment could not be satisfactorily explained,' and as the main cause was that Lady Conyngham was the King's mistress and Sumner had tutored her boys, Parliament would certainly have taken some satisfying, and no

Cabinet could have ventured on so gross a slight to the Church. The King yielded, the stall went to that Dr Clarke who lives in literary history as the man who once invited Jane Austen to write a historical novel on the House of Brunswick; Liverpool was not forgiven for some months; and Sumner was handsomely compensated elsewhere.

But the King could never dislike Liverpool for long, and, when once the Queen was removed, his antipathy was concentrated on Canning, whom by some perversity he fancied to have been her lover; who had avowedly disapproved of the proceedings against her; and was, furthermore, a strong supporter of the Catholic claims. He had resigned at the end of 1820 and two years later accepted the Governor-Generalship of India. Hastings, who suspected Canning of intriguing to oust him, did not like the prospect. Canning was not a Sahib:

'The natives are extraordinarily well informed respecting all the characters that appear on the political stage in England, and they would hold him as not of a caste fitted to preside over this Empire. Such an impression you may think of light consequence in the balance against his talents. It is not so. The patient acquiescence of the Native Princes under our sway is much influenced by their not being put to conscious shame through bowing to an undignified depositary of the British Power.'

The experiment was not made. When Canning was preparing to sail, Castlereagh died by his own hand, and to the King's bitter annoyance Liverpool, backed by Wellington, insisted that Canning should succeed.

Not least among the triumphs of Canning's diplomacy must be set his conquest of the King. He laid himself out to win both the secretary and the sovereign by those trifling attentions which cost so little and mean so much. Does the King think it would be convenient for Knighton to have a Cabinet key? Then of course Knighton shall have it, with no pedantic argument about his status. May Mrs. Canning walk under the trees of the Pavilion in the hot June weather? They look so fresh, and there are no other trees at hand. There is a vacancy among the King's Messengers. Has the King a friend whom he would like to nominate? Canning might be a Liberal: his views on South American independence might be

alarming to a European sovereign; but he was never prickly, never cross; he understood to perfection the manner which the King preferred in all who approached him; he was always deferential, never obsequious; and, subtlest of all forms of flattery, he treated George as an intellectual equal. His dispatches from Paris, long, detailed, admirably composed, without the least touch of constraint, have the air of one statesman writing to another in whose loyalty he confides, whose judgment he esteems. 'Humble duty' becomes 'humble and affectionate duty,' and sallies in the manner of Disraeli find their way into the Minister's communications:

'The remainder to Lord Norbury's second son appears to Mr Canning at first sight a strong proposal: but as the peerage must otherwise descend to the eldest son, who is an idiot, and as it appears to Mr Canning (after some recent exhibitions in the House of Lords) peculiarly desirable to avoid increasing among their Lordships the number of specimens of irregular understanding in another generation, perhaps the transmission of the peerage to the younger son would be as much an escape from a difficulty as an extension of a favour.'

When therefore in February 1827 Liverpool was laid aside by a stroke, the royal influence was all on the side of Canning. One of the most interesting documents in the collection is the authentic text of the Chief Whip's letter to Knighton analysing the situation, which hitherto had only been known from a draft. Liverpool, he says, had certainly intended that Canning should succeed him, though, in the long run, 'nothing but a Radical-Whig triumph could keep the Government out of Mr Peel's able hands.' The Duke would never do, as the head of an Ultra Tory Government, 'whose motions would be watched with all the jealousy of a military despotism, and whose legitimate acts of authority and vigour his Grace would be incapable of explaining in his own House, with the eloquence and force which the dignity and safety of the Crown require in the First Minister.' In fact, he might provoke a revolution—as in 1830 he nearly did. And Canning out of office would be as dangerous as the Duke in office. Peel, if the King's choice fell on him, 'with less experience and less eloquence, would find himself confronted with the whole body of Whigs, and

the influence and talents of Mr Canning. I have not the shadow of a doubt that the Catholic question would be revived, and I now know that it would be carried.'

It was; but—alas for the foresight even of a Chief Whip—it was carried, when Canning was gone, by Wellington and Peel.

'This would open a conflict between the two Houses and drive into the arms of the Radical Whigs one of the most powerful instruments by which the institutions and aristocracy of this country can either be protected or destroyed.

'That Mr Canning's mind is already half prepared for this course I know perfectly well, and it will require the King's wisdom and skill to avert it.'

Canning, in fact, knew that he could destroy any Government from which he was excluded; he would not serve under Wellington or Peel: the conclusion was obvious. Prime Minister he must be. He received his commission on April 10. He died on August 8 leaving poor Goody Goodrich to make what he could of the precarious coalition which Canning himself could hardly have held together much longer. For five months the country was in effect without a Government. Then, after all, the Duke was sent for. But the Tory party was collapsing: it could not resist the Catholic claims, and when once Emancipation was conceded, no issue remained to obscure the paramount question of Parliamentary Reform. The hour of the Whigs had almost struck. But the King did not live to hear it, and perhaps that was as well. Broken, dropsical, his understanding impaired, George was not equipped to stand the strain of the continuous crisis which lasted from the introduction of the Reform Bill to its passage into law. The jolly, crazy, crotchety ways of the Sailor King were a better defence against Revolution.

G. M. YOUNG.

Art. 10.—THE BRITISH COUNCIL IN EUROPE.

THE principal activities of the British Council—as I discovered from a visit I made to its headquarters in Hanover Street, London, and an extensive tour through many countries in Europe—may be grouped as follows: the award and administration of scholarships to foreign students and graduates; the support of British institutes, schools, and lectureships abroad; the organisation of tours by British musicians, theatre groups, etc.; the publicising of English literature; the establishment of lending libraries of cultural films and gramophone records; the organisation of lecture tours; and lastly co-operation with Anglophile societies. Most of these tend to stress the propagation of a knowledge of the English language among foreigners, and it will be seen that the Council's aims are strictly limited and that it resembles in no way an official ministry of propaganda. The institution with which it has most in common and whose methods it has to some extent copied is the *Alliance française*, but the resources and experience of the French society are greatly superior, as might be expected of an organisation which has celebrated its Golden Jubilee.

It was remarkable to observe that nowhere was the prestige of the Council higher than among students of the universities. Everyone seemed to know of the assistance and facilities which are available for the foreign student under the Council's auspices,* and it was obvious that competition for the scholarships was very keen, so that they are probably obtained only by students of above average ability, who are likely one day to occupy the more influential positions in their various spheres of activity. Moreover, those students who had returned from a course of study in Great Britain spoke more than enthusiastically of their experiences and of the individual attention which had been afforded even their most petty personal needs. Of all the Council's activities, which were commented on by persons of almost every type and

* 115 scholarships, valued at about 250%, are to be awarded this year to students from all over the world; in addition, 100 bursaries are granted annually to teachers of English in foreign countries and the Colonies to enable them to study for one year at an English university.

nationality, this was the only one which on no occasion came in for unfavourable criticism.

However, while students and graduates are well catered for, when the total resources of the Council are borne in mind, very little is done for children at school. This means that the opportunity of influencing the great majority who do not go to the universities is missed. In a few countries a prize essay scheme has been introduced, whereby the ten children writing the best essays in English on a subject chosen by the Council are brought here for a fortnight. It is a widespread opinion on the Continent that more money could profitably be devoted to younger children, at the expense of university students if necessary. In particular it was stressed that the opportunity of visiting Great Britain later in life is less likely to occur for children who do not join the universities than for those who do, and in view of the considerable influence that such a visit exerts on young people, it is most desirable that some way of offering this experience to children of all social classes should be made available. Anglophilism should not be identified with the professional classes exclusively, and there is certainly a tendency for this to happen, above all in countries such as Denmark and Holland, where the knowledge of English and of Great Britain is among the mass of the people infinitely less than popular legend would have us believe. As a minor point in connection with schools, the enquiry was occasionally made as to whether it was not possible for local educational authorities in this country to arrange for the loan or temporary exchange of educational equipment, such as films, with similar organisations abroad.

There is, of course, less scope for activity in Europe under the second head—support of British schools, institutes, etc.—than there is in South America and the East, where presumably the main efforts are made. Comparatively few schools on British lines exist in Europe, and it is indeed doubtful whether such organisations could survive without heavy subsidies, except in particular districts where the local demand for them is strong. It is Council policy not to undertake any work in this direction unless there is local initiative. In Tallinn, the capital of Esthland, for example, it is interest-

ing to note that the French bore almost the entire cost of grounding a Lycée, whereupon the Government, which is at present intensely Anglophile, suggested that a British grant should be made for the foundation of a similar school on British lines. On the advice of the local Foreign Office representative this was refused, and as a result the local authorities paid for and arranged the establishment of such a school themselves.

It is doubtless sound policy to be chary of granting heavy subsidies, as the danger of making Anglophilism a financially profitable profession is thereby avoided, whereas it is a sad fact that in many countries, such as Esthland, where French influence is naturally negligible and must remain so, there are not a few people who regard the French Government and state-assisted societies merely as a source of revenue. No matter how much money is spent by a country nor how much hard work is put in by individuals, experience has taught that no progress in the cultural or political sphere can be made where no genuine feeling towards the country concerned already exists among the population. Germans, French, and Italians have wasted and are still wasting vast sums without apparently having learnt this lesson. It is perhaps our good fortune that the temptation to make such a mistake has been put beyond our reach by lack of funds, but the fact that we do not cajole and bribe—because we cannot—has done more than anything else to increase our prestige on a Continent whose inhabitants are deafened with the noise and contaminated with the gifts made on behalf of rival nations and cultures.

If and when we have ten times the amount to spend in Europe on propaganda, we should never forget that no money will create initiative; but that as soon as the initiative has been taken by locals, help should not be stinted, provided that the impetus always comes from non-British sources and that sacrifices are still made by the other party in the interests of Anglophilism. The truism that what is easy to obtain is rarely prized holds good for nations as well as individuals. British educational propaganda should be directed towards creating a demand rather than supplying it. If foreigners themselves believe that British culture is something to be admired and worth an effort to obtain, they will strive

after it, which they will certainly not do if a culture is something which they are directly or indirectly paid to absorb. Also, the instinctive resistance offered by intensely nationalistic peoples to forced outside influence should not be overlooked.

In exceptional circumstances only, therefore, should money be spent in subsidising schools and such institutions—where they serve a really useful purpose or meet a definite demand, state or private commercial enterprise will found them—and it might be preferable to cut down such direct grants as are at present being made, using the money saved on allied activities, such as the loan of films and cinematic apparatus, the granting of rebates towards the purchase of English reading-books, etc., the principle of reciprocal effort on the part of the Council and the authorities concerned always being maintained. To work such an arrangement successfully, however, it is essential that the Council's advisers should be disinterested and know local conditions intimately, being able to tell exactly what efforts it would be reasonable to expect the local authorities to make, otherwise opportunities might obviously be lost through demanding the impossible. At present the Council relies mainly on the advice of the Foreign Office, but for various reasons it would be preferable for them to have their own representatives on the spot. However, the question of the British Council staff and administration touches almost all problems and will be discussed later.

Before leaving an account of the purely scholastic activities, it must be remarked that conversation with English lektors and professors at several Continental universities occasionally revealed that relations between them and the Council were not always as happy as they should be, when it is realised that these men are usually among the leaders of British activity in the host countries. University towns, perhaps particularly on the Continent, are notoriously centres of gossip and intrigue, and too much importance should not be attached to criticisms of this sort. At the same time it is obviously most important that any such feeling abroad should be reduced to a minimum. Fortunately, the Council's staff are aware of the situation and every effort is made to avoid misunderstandings. It is, incidentally, most important that

a high standard should be observed by the Council in the selection of candidates of university posts abroad, as there is intense rivalry between the various foreign professors in these universities, and it is essential that the British should be the best qualified obtainable and able to maintain their position in debate and controversy with their French and German colleagues. Unhappily, more than professional rivalry is involved, as it is often the deliberate policy of other foreigners to try to discredit British representatives at universities with the aim of causing their appointments, which are largely of recent origin, to lapse.

The organisation of tours by theatre groups and artists comes under one head, but in fact the value and success of each activity varies greatly. There are two main reasons for the success of the theatrical tours: the outstanding quality of the groups sent (Old Vic and Dublin Gate) and the high prestige which British dramatists, both of the past and present, enjoy throughout Europe to-day. In no important town on the Continent has a theatre less than three or four modern English plays in its repertoire, and quite a number of the audience attending the performances of English players go merely out of curiosity in order to hear how an old favourite sounds in its original language. Once in the theatre they are generally surprised to find that British production and acting are by no means as bad as they are generally thought to be in Europe. There is also in every country a great desire among real theatre enthusiasts to see how famous classics are interpreted by fellow-nationals of the author, and it was remarkable, in middle Europe at least, to learn that many people have only recently discovered that the English Shakespeare is in some ways essentially different from the German, in which language they had hitherto gained most of their knowledge of our greatest poet. But it is perhaps most important of all that these young companies of enthusiasts, often working under strange and difficult conditions, are rapidly dispelling the belief that the English stage is entirely under American and Jewish influence. It must be admitted that in most cases more than half the audiences understand hardly one word that is spoken on the stage; nevertheless the performances have great value in that

they afford opportunities for what was once described as 'public demonstrations of Anglophilism.' That is to say that Anglophile groups are able to turn up in force and impress themselves and others with their own strength, while, by mixing with the British residents in what, for the evening, is a British world, old enthusiasms are renewed and fresh ones born. Socially and culturally, the theatre and theatre-going play a much more important rôle than they do in Great Britain.

To some extent, this is also true of attendance at concerts given by visiting British musicians and singers, although here a deep-rooted prejudice against British music has still to be overcome. Moreover, there is a tendency—understandable from the human standpoint—for the organisers to lay stress on the performers rather than on the music, and the programmes are not always happily chosen. Most people will admit that the British standards in the execution of music, with brilliant exceptions, compare not altogether favourably with those demanded on the Continent, and the works of well-known German, Italian, and French composers played or sung by competent musicians are of no great interest to people who have heard such programmes a hundred times before. As much stress as possible is laid on British music, and although trouble is undoubtedly taken to try to adjust programmes to suit the temperament and musical upbringing of the various audiences all over Europe, the difficulties are obviously very great and complete success is not always obtained. A certain repugnance to Elizabethan music was noticeable everywhere on the Continent. As one person put it, in a gallant, if not immediately comprehensible, attempt to bear out his statement that English music has something in common with Scotch whisky—'not a note is told, till it's centuries old.' This, if untrue, is an indication of the general opinion.

One would think that the Council had an easy task with those activities which are devoted to the publicising of English literature. Long before any definite propaganda efforts were made, British authors, by the merits of their writings alone, had won a strong position on the Continent which in normal times of peace would have remained secure. Even now, when nationalistic theories, censorship, and currency restrictions all work

to the disadvantage of the English writer, when they are not actually manipulated against him, English authors are still translated to a remarkable extent and their following has hardly declined, while foreign publishers, in spite of an often unhelpful attitude shown by their British colleagues, are waging a ceaseless battle with their own authorities for the right to translate all works worthy of the honour.

It is difficult to see how the Council can help in this field, but a vast amount could be done to encourage the sales of books in English, for while English works appear in all languages, the position of the book in English is far from satisfactory. To some extent the blame must be taken by British publishers, for most firms in this country refuse to offer books to Continental booksellers on the 'sale or return' system, whereas their German rivals, particularly, show the greatest enterprise in supplying their works without risk to the bookseller, and in giving him adequate display and publicity matter. (In almost every country in Europe the sale of German books still very nearly approaches and often exceeds that of books in English.) One disadvantage which it is hard to overcome is that foreign books are usually cheaper than English, and it was not until the advent of such series as the 'Penguin' that many English works came within the scope of the average foreigner's pocket. But the same story of lack of British enterprise is heard everywhere. Everything is made difficult for the seller of English books, except for individual firms in Scandinavia and Holland, whereas French and German publishers do all they can to meet the special needs of foreign booksellers.

Such efforts as the Council has made in this direction have been conspicuously successful and reveal how little a vast market has been exploited. Book exhibitions were recently held in Esthland and Finland—on the lines of the annual Book Fair—largely through the initiative of local people. The business done exceeded the expectations of the organisers, but such spurts in sales can only be of a temporary nature. Some regular system is needed, whereby the English book can be made much more readily available to the foreign buyer, and it should not be difficult to arrange this. In every town visited

the good will of the booksellers was obvious: it might be said that they were pathetically anxious to co-operate. Their main difficulties were stated to be: first, few British publishers will supply books on credit under the arrangement that all copies not sold are returnable and that accounts are settled at widely spaced intervals; secondly, British publishers—with one or two exceptions—do not employ regular travellers, make no effort to publicise books locally, and are, for example, rarely willing to supply review copies to important national journals (it seems fantastic that in a town like Stockholm, where many tens of thousands of English books are sold, leading papers are expected to buy copies of books they wish to review, whereas editors of the most unimportant publications in England have solved the gift problem by using unwanted review copies of books which are thrust at them); thirdly, British publishers have made small effort to study the Continental market, in many ways different from our own, are often ignorant of customs and other regulations, and for the most part are unable or unwilling to correspond in any language except English. The publisher's answer to all this would probably be that the amount of business available does not make it worth his while to take special trouble. Even if this were true, and except for the very small firms it probably is not, the country as a whole cannot afford to take entirely a financial view of the matter. It is pointless for the Council to spend vast sums on encouraging the learning of English if Europeans are not to have ready access to English books, which for most people are the only means by which a knowledge of the language can be maintained.

The suggestion most generally made was that some sort of central body should be set up with whom all foreign booksellers, who are approved members of their national organisations, could deal. Books would be supplied on the 'sale or return' system, travellers would be employed, and definite arrangements made for the publicising of books, organisation of exhibitions, supply of review copies, general liaison with the local press, etc. There seems to be no reason why such an organisation would not be brought into being under the Council's auspices, and, as a normal commission could be charged,

it might well in a short space of time become revenue-producing. There is no space here to go into details of such a scheme, nor indeed would there be much point in doing so except in consultation with British publishers and foreign booksellers. But experience shows that unless the Council take the initiative no one else is likely to do so. Incidentally, it must be that the liaison between the Council and the foreign book trade is not sufficiently close, or else surely something on these lines would have been begun long ago.

Scarcely less important than the sale of books is the sale of the better periodicals and of reviews. One or two editors have already done much to try to increase circulation on the Continent by granting special rates of subscription to students and people genuinely unable to afford the normal charges, by circularising universities, clubs, and Anglophile societies, by liberally supplying specimen copies to interested people and so on. But the currency restrictions alone are a considerable difficulty, which could be overcome by a body which has regularly to disburse large sums in every country, and much effort would be spared and more progress made if work of this sort were centralised. The Council, by means of its representatives and connections everywhere, should be able to develop some sort of organisation for publicising periodicals, arranging subscriptions and answering enquiries. The number of potential readers is larger than generally supposed, but no real advance can be made until continued and co-ordinated efforts have had their effect. Once again, such an activity would in the long run be more likely to prove a source of revenue than a drain on funds. Obviously, if ever a central distributing office for books were organised, that could also work on behalf of periodicals.

On the subject of the films and gramophone records supplied by the Council, opinion was unpleasantly unanimous. Some of the films have been so bad that the people concerned have not dared to exhibit them. The Council cannot be blamed for this, as no films are made under its auspices, but they only arrange the distribution of cultural 'shorts' such as those produced by the Travel and Industrial Development Association. To repeat the remarks of those all over Europe who are concerned with

showing these films would be to print a lively and entertaining diatribe, but it would have little practical value, as the blunt fact is that many of the propaganda films made in this country * fall well below the accepted world standards on every count. The Council are aware of this. While it must be appreciated that the main solution is in other hands, it surely should be possible for them to ensure that no blatantly poor films are sent out. Really bad films do harm, and it would be better to spend any money available in an effort to maintain a smaller number of films in circulation, but all of which would be—may one say?—endurable.

With records, it was not the quality which was complained of, but rather the selection. It is the custom for batches to be sent out for such purposes as broadcasting programmes in small countries and concerts in schools, and on more than one occasion it was alleged that very unsuitable selections had been sent. It might, therefore, be an advantage if the musical department could afford to study more closely the problems of popular approach and national characteristics, for the aim of such programmes should be to reach the peasants and masses rather than the academic few.

In general, opinions expressed on all the activities mentioned up to now were more or less reconcilable with one another, but there was some divergence of views as to the value of the Council's lecture tours. There are two schools of thought: those who said that lectures—in English at least—were useless, and those who thought that some lectures in certain countries were very popular and served some purpose. In Scandinavia, however, it can be broadly stated that most of the lecturers sent have been successful, although the point was made that it was the personality who counted rather than what he or she said. People will flock to see a famous personage, not to hear a lecture, which even in Denmark a considerable proportion of the audience will only partially understand. But the tours of minor personalities, unless they are trained and brilliant speakers on a subject of the widest popular interest, should be avoided. In countries other than Scandinavia, Holland, and possibly Esthland,

* Except those of the G.P.O., which received much favourable comment.

the impression formed was that lectures in English have a very limited value. Moreover, the lecture tours tend to be confined to the capitals, whose inhabitants are surfeited with lecturers sent under subsidies from every great Power in Europe.

Nevertheless, for reasons of prestige, as any slackening of British effort at this time might be misconstrued, it is important that some sort of lecture activity should be maintained. It would be possible, moreover, to increase results if funds allowed the present policy to be radically altered for countries where English is poorly understood. The spirits of the converted must be kept up, and therefore they must be preached to on occasion, but the main task should be among the unconverted, who, in other words, are those who do not speak English. In addition to sending English lecturers to the capitals of many countries, might it not be possible to send people who can lecture in the local language and arrange that they cover one country thoroughly, visiting all the main towns? In the provinces, such a visit would be an event to be remembered and discussed for long afterwards. The Germans have begun to do this, and it is reported that, in spite of the prejudice they have to overcome—and there is rarely any against us—their success has been remarkable.

Although co-operation with Anglophile societies is classed as an activity by itself, it really overlaps all the others, as local Anglophiles are inevitably associated in some way or other with all the work of the Council in an area. There are three distinct types of society: one, such as that in Stockholm, whose aims are perhaps social rather than cultural; a second, which is poorer because most members belong to the student classes and it is often out of touch with the local British colony; a third, such as in Helsingfors, which is moderately wealthy, has energetic leadership, is organised into sub-groups—hiking clubs, dramatic societies, and so on—which can appeal to all types and classes and offer a social centre to its members. While the financial assistance given naturally varies according to the resources of the society, as far as can be judged, the Council treats them otherwise roughly alike. While it would be undesirable to ignore the first entirely, it might be

preferable to devote the greatest effort and the most money to the second—such as by offering the loan of paid, full-time secretaries for a period of revivification, for lack of funds and adequate quarters leads to stagnation more than anything else and a vicious circle of declining membership and falling revenue sets in—and merely to maintain the closest personal contact with the third, offering all the encouragement and advice required.

With very few exceptions, most of the officials and leading members of the societies spoke enthusiastically of the Council's work, and, quite apart from the psychological value of the knowledge that an organisation exists to assist them in their efforts, many of the clubs would hardly be able to survive were it not for the grants and supplies of books, periodicals, gramophone records, etc., which are regularly received. Yet, as with the British professors at universities, a lack of complete harmony was sometimes detectable between members of the Council's staff and the local people. Individual complaints are trivial, but dissatisfaction was not unfrequently expressed—although with great diffidence and politeness. When summed up, it seems that the main trouble may be that the Council is over-centralised—all the full-time administrative staff is employed in London—and that certain individuals have not a complete understanding of the various foreign mentalities and are not as well informed as might be concerning areas where they administer British cultural activities. In work of the sort for which the Council is responsible, two things are essential: a complete lack of insularity of outlook and close personal contact between all concerned, however indirectly, with the main objects pursued. The first should obviously influence the choice of personnel, and the second is a matter for internal organisation.

A suggestion frequently made was that the Council should establish a sub-office in each of the zones into which Europe is divided for administrative purposes. The zone secretary would work in that office, and he should be proficient in the languages of the area or at least one of them and the local *lingua franca*. Regular tours should be made of the zone, and contacts made and maintained with all individuals and societies within it who are interested in the Council's work. In every case, there

are local British residents who would willingly work in concert with him, and whose great local knowledge could be more fully utilised than it is at present. (Altogether, comparatively little use seems to be made of the local British colonies by the Council, in direct contrast to the French and German method, which is to devote much time to their own nationals, who are thus a well-organised body of part-time assistants, whose connections and influence are spread throughout the countries concerned.) Within the London headquarters, the departments would be divided under activities only, and each local secretary would deal directly with the department concerned on any matters arising in his zone, but any person or society would communicate through the secretary. A few roving liaison officers—one for each continent—whose main function would be to observe and report, would complete such an organisation, which is very little different from that already adopted by the Council, except that everything at present is under one roof. Among other things, it should be remembered that such a system would be well adapted for any considerable expansion if that ever takes place. Obviously, much of the foregoing must be regarded as counsel of perfection, unattainable with the present resources. Nevertheless, the present arrangement, whereby the Council's representation on the spot is in the hands of part-time employees, voluntary helpers, press attachés, or consuls, often chosen by force of circumstance, is plainly not ideal and unlikely to be able to stand the strain which, there is every reason to suppose, may in the near future be imposed on it. The remedy surely lies in the hands of the Treasury.

FRANK CLEMENTS.

Art. 11.—THE GULF STREAM AND BRITISH FISHERIES.

'THERE is a river in the ocean. In the severest droughts it never fails, and in the mightiest floods it never overflows. Its banks and its bottom are of cold water, while its current is of warm. The Gulf of Mexico is its fountain, and its mouth is in the Arctic Seas. It is the Gulf Stream. There is in the world no other such majestic flow of waters. Its current is more rapid than the Mississippi or the Amazon, and its volume more than a thousand times greater.'

It was with these words of dignified rhetoric that Lieutenant M. F. Maury, U.S.N., began his account of 'The Physical Geography of the Sea.' The publication in 1855 of this famous book may be said to mark the establishment of the modern science of physical oceanography. Like all such pioneer works, it represents the conclusion of one epoch in the growth of knowledge as well as the beginning of a new one. And Maury's conception of the Gulf Stream as a river in the ocean is that of his predecessors rather than of his successors.

The Gulf Stream was first encountered in 1513 by the Spanish explorer Ponce de Leon, who, sailing northward from Porto Rico, discovered the peninsula, as he thought the island, of Florida. On the return journey the vessels found themselves in 'a current such that, although they had a great wind, they could not proceed forward, but backward, and it seemed that they were proceeding well; and in the end it was known that it was in such wise the current which was more powerful than the wind.' Six years later we find Antonio de Alaminos, the navigator of Ponce de Leon, making use of the Gulf Stream in his return voyage from Mexico to Spain. For several days he sailed northward in the current before turning eastwards towards Europe. But although it became well known to navigators, the Gulf Stream remained uncharted for over two and a half centuries after its discovery. Shortly before the American War of Independence complaints reached Benjamin Franklin, at that time post-master, that the English mail-packets invariably took several days longer over the voyage to Boston than did the heavily laden cargo vessels sailing into Naragansett Bay. Franklin

went into the matter with typical energy. He found that the Rhode Island captains were acquainted with the Gulf Stream, whereas the English were not. He took observations during voyages across the Atlantic, and states: 'A stranger may know when he is in the Gulf Stream by the warmth of the water; the warmth of that water, which the stream forms, being much greater than the warmth of the water on each side of it. If the navigator is bound to the westward, he should cross the stream and get out of it as soon as possible; whereas, if you get into the Gulf Stream, you will be retarded by it at the rate of sixty to seventy miles a day.' He prepared from his accumulated data a chart showing the Gulf Stream as a great river passing northward off the coast of Florida, then north-east as far as the southern limits of the Newfoundland Banks, and finally eastward across the Atlantic. He tells how he had this engraved 'on the old chart of the Atlantic, at Mount and Page's, Tower-hill; and copies sent down to Falmouth for the captains of the packets, who slighted it, however.' This scorn of the English sea-captains for the advice of the American post-master delayed transport of men and supplies to America during the civil war and so contributed to the success of the colonists.

The detailed survey of the Gulf Stream may be said to date from 1845, when it came under the sphere of operations of the Coast Survey of the United States, directed at that time by Alexander Dallas Bache, a great-grandson of Franklin. The survey was concerned especially with the current which runs along the coast of America, and information about its further course across the Atlantic and its ultimate fate in the far northern waters of the Arctic beyond Norway remained incomplete. The oceans form a great thermo-dynamic machine. Heat enters in the equatorial and warm zones and is lost in the polar seas. The former regions represent the boilers, the latter the condensers. It is the forces so generated which are responsible for the great ocean currents which bring salts from polar seas to nourish the plant life, and so indirectly the animals, of the tropics, and which carry oxygen into the great depths of the ocean which would otherwise be lifeless wastes. The most important of these currents flow far below the surface, on the bed of the ocean or in the intermediate depths. But there is also a surface

circulation the nature of which is influenced by wind, while both currents and winds are deflected by the rotation of the earth. In the absence of any land, surface currents would move in broad belts around the globe. On either side of the equator these would move westward with a counter current in the opposite direction between ; farther to the north and south the flow would be to the east, in the Arctic and Antarctic west again.

But the presence of the continents profoundly influences these currents, and nowhere more than in the North Atlantic, with its deeply embayed margins which converge towards the Arctic. The waters of the North Equatorial Current flow westward into the Caribbean Sea, where they are joined by those of the South Equatorial Current which strike the northern shores of South America and by them are deflected north-west. The united waters then pass through the narrow confines of the Strait of Yucatan into the rounded cul-de-sac which is the Gulf of Mexico. Here the water accumulates. It was formerly claimed that the waters of the Gulf were three feet higher than those of the ocean outside ; the most accurate modern measurements reduce this figure to something under a foot. But even this represents an immense weight of water, which constitutes the driving force behind the Gulf Stream.

The piled-up waters seek the only possible escape. They move eastward through the Straits between Florida and Cuba, then, finding further passage in this direction blocked by the Great Bahama Bank, they turn to the north. It is within the semicircle of these Straits of Florida that the Gulf Stream most nearly merits Maury's description of it as a river in the ocean. It becomes restricted to a width of some fifty miles opposite Cape Florida, where its average velocity is about three and a half knots. But this only applies to the surface waters ; at one hundred fathoms the speed is reduced to two knots, at two hundred fathoms to half this, while in deeper water still the current disappears or is even replaced by water movements in the opposite direction. It far surpasses all rivers in the volume of water it carries. Hourly past Cape Florida some hundred thousand million tons of water move northward into the Atlantic. Even the Mississippi swollen in the greatest floods does not discharge

more than one five hundredth part of this volume of water hourly.

The deep blue waters of the Gulf Stream are joined, north of the Bahamas, by those of the Antilles Current which have flowed westward along the northern boundaries of the West Indies. The two unite into a broad current of highly saline water, which, with gradually diminishing flow, moves north-eastward parallel to the coast. Opposite the promontory of Cape Hatteras the current is two hundred miles in width, but its speed has fallen to little more than a knot. It now begins to spread out, like the delta of a river, into bands of warm water interspersed with colder areas. The line of the coast and the rotation of the earth combine to deflect it farther and farther towards the east until it encounters, south of the Newfoundland Banks, the southerly flowing, intensely cold waters of the Labrador Current.

In this region the Gulf Stream, if by that we mean the current produced by the piling up of waters within the Gulf of Mexico, ceases to exist. The energy which propelled it through the Straits of Florida has now been dissipated. But it remains as a mass of warm saline water which is carried slowly, at an average velocity of less than half a knot, in a north-easterly direction across the Atlantic. The westerly winds now provide the great part of the motive force, and it becomes more suitably termed the North Atlantic, or Gulf Stream, Drift. Moving gradually towards the shores of Europe the waters of the North Atlantic Drift unite with other warm waters which flow northward from the coasts of Africa and Spain, and this 'Atlantic water' flows around our coasts and beyond into the Norwegian Sea, to be lost finally in the Arctic between Norway and Spitsbergen. Over its waters blow winds that take up heat derived from the tropical sun of the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico and carry it over the countries of Northern Europe. On the opposite shores of the Atlantic it is the Arctic cold which is being carried south by the Labrador Current. The mean temperature from the coldest month of the year at the Arctic circle in Norway is freezing-point, in the same latitude on the American continent it is 13 degrees below freezing-point.

This profound effect of the continual north-easterly

drift of warm Atlantic water on our climate has long been known; what is now becoming apparent, by the slowly accumulating data of marine biological research, is the equally vital effect these waters have on the productivity of our fishing grounds. The fluctuations in the population of marine fishes from year to year is immense. In one year a particular fishery may yield a great harvest; in the next year, or series of years, it may be a partial or complete failure. It is possible by studying the rings on the scales or in the ear-stones of fishes to establish their age and in this manner to determine, given samples of adequate size, the age composition of the population from year to year. And instead of the population being composed in roughly equal proportions of all ages, allowing for increasing destruction with advancing age, it is not infrequently found that the bulk of the population is composed of animals of the same age. To take a specific example. In the season 1934-35 of the herrings landed at Plymouth no less than 91 per cent. were six years or under, but in succeeding years there was a steady increase in the proportion of older fish, so that in 1936-37 over 80 per cent. of the catch consisted of these fish. At the same time the total weight of fish landed had fallen to a mere 2 per cent. of what it had been in 1924-25.

The population of any species of fish is made good from time to time by vast numbers of animals of a particular 'year class.' For several years this provides the mainstay of the fisheries, but its numbers gradually diminish and, unless another good year class appears, the total population will fall so low as to spell disaster to the fishery. This is what has happened with the Plymouth herring. Now a good year class represents the survival of unusually large numbers of the young hatched out of the eggs laid in that particular year, and it follows from this that success or failure of any particular fishery depends on the conditions which prevail annually when the eggs are laid and the young fish emerge from these. If we are to understand the fluctuations in the stock of fish we must know what are the conditions which control the survival or death of the young fish. While the possession of this knowledge would not enable us to alter conditions so as to ensure an abundant survival of young fish annually, it would make possible accurate forecasts of the productivity

of any given fishery in succeeding years. And this is one of the great objects of modern fishery research. We cannot hope to farm the open waters of the sea as we do the surface of the land, but we can hope to be able to say annually in what numbers and in what areas particular fishes will be abundant. In this way a great economy of effort, with a corresponding increase in efficiency of the fishing industry, may be effected.

The animal population in any area depends on the plant population. The meadows of the oceans consist of microscopic organisms which drift in countless millions in the surface waters. They are known collectively as the plant plankton. They depend in their turn on sunlight, in the presence of which their green chlorophyll can form sugars from carbon dioxide and water, and from this they are able, by the further incorporation in their tissues of salts containing nitrogen and phosphorus, to build up the more complex proteins. During the spring and summer there is never any lack of sunlight in the surface waters where these plants live. There is also always an abundance of carbon dioxide dissolved in the water. But the supplies of nutrient salts containing nitrogen and phosphorus are strictly limited, and it is the quantities of these which control the abundance of plants and so of the animals which feed, directly or indirectly, on these.

It follows, other things being equal, that the productivity of any area in the sea can be estimated when we know the available supplies of these all-important salts. But, so far as the waters around our own shores are concerned, these supplies are not constant. They depend to a notable extent on incursions of Atlantic water frequently richly laden with them. There are two routes by which this water may enter the confined regions between these islands and the continent of Europe—around the north of Scotland into the northern regions of the North Sea or directly into the English Channel. Owing to the location at Plymouth of the largest of British marine biological laboratories we know most about conditions in the latter area. We know that since 1931, the year when the supply of herring in this area became seriously depleted, there has been a steady falling off in the essential supplies of phosphorus in the waters

off the south of Devon and Cornwall. We have evidence also that in these years Atlantic water has not entered the Channel.

By any ordinary criterion the difference between Atlantic and Channel water is slight indeed. A minute difference in salinity and temperature, with sometimes, because this depends on the time of the year and the actual source of the water, an increase in phosphorus measured in terms of milligrams per cubic metre. But although these differences need accurate chemical and physical measurements for their determination, these waters represent totally distinct environments to animals which live in this most constant of mediums, the sea. It has been found, by determining the limits of conditions under which a fish will form a conditioned reflex, that these animals will respond to a rise in temperature of no more than one thirtieth of a degree centigrade, while they are capable of detecting the presence of food substances in the water at concentrations of some three thousandths of one per cent. It is therefore not so surprising to find that the population of Atlantic water, despite its minute difference in chemical constitution from Channel water, is quite distinct from that of the latter. There are a number of animals, most notably species of the minute arrow worms, which have been revealed as ideal 'biological indicators.' The experienced biologist, by an accurate determination of the species of animals caught within the fine meshes of his silk tow-nets, is now able to tell at once the nature of the water from which these came. The lengthy and painstaking analyses of the chemist are no longer necessary for this purpose.

In the Channel water one species of arrow worm is found, another in the mixed Atlantic water farther west. As the supplies of phosphate in the waters off Plymouth have diminished, so have the arrow worms characteristic of the Atlantic been replaced almost completely by those typical of the Channel water. When the former return we may hope for a corresponding increase in the amounts of phosphate and, in the long run, a replenishment of the now depleted fisheries of the Plymouth district. The same conditions undoubtedly prevail in the North Sea and in Norwegian waters. In some years Atlantic

waters extend far south into the North Sea, in other years they enter only its more northern regions. This ebb and flow of Atlantic water appears to have a profound effect on the fish. We know that when there is a bad herring year there is always a good spawning of the haddock. This is a more northern fish, and it may be that when the Atlantic water does not extend far into the North Sea the haddock benefit to a much greater extent than in the years when it extends farther south and the herrings consume much of the rich food it brings. In both cases the greater size of the brood may be the direct result of the richer feeding of the parent.

Thus in the Channel and in the North Sea alike we find long-period fluctuations in the conditions prevailing on our fishing grounds. Until the causes of these are known it will be impossible accurately to foretell conditions from year to year, and so the ideal aim of all fishery research cannot be attained. We must be able to put our finger on this great pulse of the sea.

This brings us back to the waters of the Atlantic Drift and to the far distant Gulf of Mexico from which they come. It is this pulse that we need to feel, and the problem is where to do it. Far out in the Atlantic, some ten degrees north of the tropic of Cancer and between five and six hundred miles from the coast of America, lie the Bermudan Islands. They are the most northerly coral islands in the world, the summit of the volcanic elevation on which they lie being crowned with wind-blown, æolian limestone of coral origin. This has been cut into by the sea, leaving a picturesque semicircle of islands lying in the midst of a region of shallow water studded with corals and rich in all the brightly coloured aquatic life typical of coral reefs the world over. On all sides of this restricted submarine plateau the bottom descends steeply to depths of over two miles.

Bermuda has long been the centre of marine biological research. Its easy accessibility from New York led to the establishment in 1903 by the Universities of Harvard and New York of the Bermuda Biological Station, which for the greater part of its career occupied an old military magazine on Agar's Island in the entrance to Hamilton Harbour. But facilities and equipment were inadequate to deal with the wealth of problems presented in this

ideal environment, and in 1926 there was incorporated the Bermuda Biological Station for Research with American, Bermudan, and British trustees. A munificent benefaction from the Rockefeller Foundation made possible the purchase of a former hotel, delightfully situated on the shores of Ferry Reach near St. George's, the second town on the islands. Adequate alterations were made to the building, laboratories and aquaria were fitted, boats purchased, and in January 1932 the Station was formally opened in the presence of the Governor of Bermuda.

Thus it was that when the solution of the crucial problem facing British fishery research was seen to lie not in home waters but in the vagaries of the Gulf Stream far across the Atlantic, the eyes of marine biologists were turned at once to Bermuda. From there and from nowhere else could a finger be placed on the pulse of the Gulf Stream which flows northward between Bermuda and the coast of America. The great Danish oceanographer, the late Professor Johannes Schmidt, aptly compared Bermuda to 'a research vessel anchored in mid-ocean.' The vessel was there and, thanks to the energies of the trustees of the Biological Station, it was equipped with laboratories. Only an adequate sea-going vessel was lacking. The provision of this and of additional scientific staff at the Station was made possible by a grant from the Development Commission of this country, the money being administered by a committee of the Royal Society. At the present time work is being actively prosecuted both from Bermuda and from the Oceanographic Institution at Woods Hole in Massachusetts, the two institutions working in the closest co-operation. No branch of science is so international as oceanography and outside the narrow limits of territorial waters the research vessels of all nations work in the closest liaison, pooling knowledge for the benefit of all maritime nations.

It is still much too early to forecast the success of this venture, for although knowledge about the Gulf Stream is already rapidly being increased, it will be many years before changes so far away can be accurately correlated with later movements of Atlantic water around our coasts. But this work at Bermuda is the logical

outcome of the patient labours of biological and physical oceanographers working in the shallow waters on the continental shelf of Europe. Few in numbers and working, until recent years, under indifferent conditions, they have gradually unravelled the tangled skein of cause and effect in the greatest and most obscure of environments until the thread has run beyond their grasp. If, at long last, the solution to their problems is revealed in the vagaries of the great stream that flows through the Straits of Florida, it will represent the completion of their work and be the ultimate triumph of all those who devoted energies of brain and body towards the solution of the mysteries that lay concealed beneath the turbulent waters of the narrow seas.

C. M. YONGE.

Art. 12.—THE ENGLISH WAY OF LIFE.*

FASCIST writers and orators make great play with the word *storico*, and it is one of the truest doctrines of Fascism that human conduct is influenced less by pure logic or by material interests than by history, tradition, and custom. Of no people in Europe is this more true than of the English, and their outlook is the result of the long and continuous historical development of their country. The law and the courts have both evolved without interruption since the Conquest in 1066, and the Norman kings sought on numerous occasions to conciliate the conservative English by promising to maintain inviolate the old laws and customs of the Anglo-Saxons. In 1923 Parliament repealed a statute which had been in vigour since 1285. The customary law administered by the courts to-day has been built up gradually during the last 800 years and is found in a mass of reported judgments, of which the oldest date from before 1190. This customary law has been continually supplemented and modified by a legislature which is almost as ancient as the courts themselves, and which has enjoyed an equally smooth and uninterrupted development.

As far back as we go in history, we find Englishmen priding themselves upon the individual rights and liberties which they enjoy under their Constitution. In 1470 we find Sir John Fortescue, the Chief Justice, in 'De Laudibus Legum Angliæ,' contrasting with typically English complacency the freedom of the Englishman with the miserable servitude of poor foreigners under absolute rulers. He found in Parliament the protection of the freedom of the subjects, and said: 'A King of England cannot, at his pleasure, make any alteration in the laws of the land . . . a people governed by such laws as are made by their own consent and approbation enjoy their properties securely, and without the hazard of being deprived of them by the King or any other.'

* This article was written at the request of an Italian periodical as one of a series expressing representative British views on various political, literary, and artistic subjects. Certain modifications in the article were asked for which the writer was not willing to make. The article seeks to present to Italians a modern Conservative's view of the English polity. The Addendum has been put in at this later date for the English publication.

Throughout the centuries, changes in the economic system of England have brought corresponding political changes, but at no point has there been any abrupt break in the continuity of tradition. As feudalism gave place to the centralised administrative system of the Tudors, so the ancient baronage yielded power in the House of Lords to the new nobility recruited from Ministers of the Crown ; under the Stuarts popular opinion asserted itself, and so the House of Commons became more powerful than the House of Lords ; after the coming of the Hanoverians in 1714 there emerged the modern party Cabinet with a Prime Minister at its head. It is typical of the continuity of English history that No. 10 Downing Street was the residence of Sir Robert Walpole, the first Prime Minister, as it is of Mr Neville Chamberlain to-day. Under this same Constitution Britain has advanced in wealth, has become a great Power, and has built up and maintained a far-stretching Empire. It is perhaps natural, therefore, that English Conservatives should regard their own system of government as being in no way inferior to more recent systems on the totalitarian model. These have not yet achieved comparable results, nor have they yet had the opportunity of showing equal permanency.

Change there has been in England, of course, and many political institutions have even become entirely transformed. This has been a slow process, and often the form has been preserved while the function has altered. Political changes have generally been the result of economic changes, and of these the most important was the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century. It has now spread throughout the world, making possible everywhere the modern mechanical life. It started in England for three reasons : first, because Englishmen invented the first machines ; secondly, because the proximity of coal and iron facilitated manufacture ; and thirdly because there already existed the accumulated wealth in the country necessary for large industrial development. Britain, therefore, is entitled to much credit for what is good in modern developments, but equally must accept a large share of responsibility for the evils which have followed from the principle of *laissez faire*.

In this twentieth century, however, it is recognised almost as fully in Britain as in Italy that the days of free competition are over, and we no longer believe that man's self-interest is God's good providence. Although we have not adopted any official doctrine on economics, as Italy has done, the duty of the State to exercise an overriding supervision of industry is now generally recognised. Institutions like the Bank of England, though still in form private companies, are administered as public trusts and not for the purpose of earning the largest dividends for the shareholders. In other cases private enterprise has been deliberately replaced by what may be called a public trust. Certain individuals are appointed to administer some service according to a policy laid down by the Government, but with free discretion in all matters of routine administration. The intention is to obtain the advantages of public control while ensuring administration on sound business lines, unhampered by bureaucratic control or political interference. It is significant that the present National Government, predominantly Conservative in composition, took the transport of London out of the hands of private companies and put it under a public board of this kind.

Even in the case of industries where this quasi-nationalisation does not seem to be the appropriate form of management, there has still been a noteworthy tendency to substitute co-operation for competition. Thus many industries, including coal mining, iron and steel, and the tramp shipping industry, are now controlled by committees representative of all engaged therein, which negotiate in the name of the industry both with the Government and with outside parties. There is general recognition in England that the Government must be entitled to control the economic activities of its citizens in the interests of the community. If this is regarded as the Fascist corporate State, Britain has to that extent gone Fascist.

British industry has shown since the War remarkable flexibility, and new industries have in large measure taken the place of old staple industries like coal and cotton, whose markets have declined largely for reasons beyond our control. We do recognise, however, that these new industries cannot replace in the export market what we have lost ; the industrialisation of other countries

and the growth of economic nationalism abroad will prevent us from ever regaining the position of workshop of the world. The prosperity of British industry depends now more on the home and less on the export market than used to be the case. Whatever may be the position with regard to industry, the financial predominance of Britain in these last years has probably been greater than ever before. When Britain left the Gold Standard in 1931, so many of the countries of the world linked their currencies with the pound that sterling is now an international currency of comparable importance with gold and of incomparably greater importance than any other single currency.

All our industrial and financial resources have lately been used to good purpose, and the last twenty-five years have seen the development of social services in Britain on a scale with which no other country can compete. The great systems of insurance against unemployment and of assistance for those who are unemployed but cannot draw insurance benefit have alleviated the effects of economic depression upon the workers. The development of physical training for children, the provision of meals and milk at a low price—or, where necessary, free—is improving the health of the rising generation. Insurance against sickness and the provision of pensions is giving to the aged some security against suffering and want. It is indeed remarkable that at a period when the prosperity of Britain is no longer increasing as rapidly as it was, so much wiser and more democratic is the use made of our national income that the working classes are better off than ever before. It is as a result of the vitality of British industry and the development of these social services that the standard of living in Britain is higher than in any country in Europe. We have, in fact, disproved the chief assumption of Karl Marx that under Capitalism the rich must ever get richer and the poor must ever get poorer. Amongst the many crude fallacies of Communist teaching there is, however, one true principle which the State should, in so far as it is practicable, seek to apply. That principle is 'from each according to his means, to each according to his needs.' It has in a moderate and reasonable manner been superimposed on the industrial system by the steeply graduated taxation

on incomes and inherited fortunes out of which our social services are largely financed.

The policy of Britain is affected in every aspect by its imperial responsibilities and connections, but there is a widespread misunderstanding abroad of the character of the British Empire. It is not generally realised that there is a complete difference in the status of the British Dominions and of the Colonies. Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand are from almost all points of view entirely independent countries, linked with Britain only by voluntary allegiance to a common Sovereign. The Government in London neither exercises nor desires to exercise any control over those four countries. It is admitted that they are not under any obligation to lend assistance to Britain in war unless they choose to do so ; they impose restrictions upon immigrants from Great Britain which may be more severe than the restrictions by some foreign countries ; they have erected protective tariffs against British goods in order to foster their own home industries. If in 1914 and again in the crisis of 1938 those Dominions were prepared to support Great Britain, it only serves to show how a common tradition and a common outlook on world affairs may keep in partnership a number of countries who are not subject to any binding links.

The case of the Colonies is entirely different, for they are under the direct control of the Home Government. Even here, however, it is the recognised principle that the administration should aim at the welfare of the Colonies and not at that of the parent country, if ever those interests are in conflict. There have been cases where we have fallen below this level of conduct, and they are of course quoted by those on the continent of Europe who deny that there is any altruism in politics and regard a claim to practise it as mere Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy. India offers an example, however, of this altruism being applied. There has never been a time when the military domination of India would have been easier than in the twentieth century. Tanks, lorries, aeroplanes, and wireless have all facilitated the task of holding a conquered country in subjection. In spite of that fact, the Government of India Act, 1935, gave to popularly elected Indian Ministers responsibility for the administration of great

Indian Provinces, some of them containing populations larger than that of Italy. In the great sub-continent of India, democratic institutions are now being introduced, despite their disappearance in some of the countries of Europe. Moreover, for fourteen years before the passing of this Act, India had enjoyed and exercised the right to establish a tariff system for the purpose of protecting her infant industries against those of England. The same principle is being increasingly applied to the Colonies.

Whether or not the Colonies are profitable to Britain has been questioned. Certainly many of the poorer ones receive subsidies from the English Exchequer and none even of the richest pay any tribute, except a small sum in respect of naval defence. There is, however, no doubt that in indirect ways they are a valuable asset. The pay and pensions of colonial officials are a financial benefit, and the preference which they show for British goods, even where there is no preferential tariff, is undoubtedly of considerable value to the British export trade. Until 1932 no preferential tariffs existed and all nations enjoyed the same rights of free competition in the Colonies as did England herself. The growth of economic nationalism elsewhere was responsible for the introduction of imperial preference into the British Empire, but as these preferences were bilateral it is believed that they have been as beneficial to the Colonies as they have been to the parent country. The fact that the autonomous governments of the Dominions have voluntarily entered into similar agreements is some evidence that the Colonies have not been unfairly treated in being brought into the same preferential customs union.

The general outlook expressed in the preceding paragraphs may be taken as that of a progressive English Conservative of the present day. In some respects the political scientist will detect ideas which he has previously associated with the Liberal and Labour Parties. During the last twenty years the creeds of all three Parties have become largely assimilated, and while the Conservatives have borrowed freely from the Labour and Liberal Parties, these others have borrowed not less extensively from the Conservative philosophy. It was for this reason that in 1931 it was possible for the leaders of all three Parties to combine and form a National Government which

has survived unshaken and unimpaired down to the present day. Nor is this community of outlook limited to the supporters of the National Government. Foreigners who assume from the debates in the House of Commons that there is a fundamental difference of outlook between the Government and the two Oppositions are greatly mistaken. Political controversy of a mild kind is regarded as desirable, and Mr Disraeli, the great leader of the Conservative Party in the nineteenth century, said that the duty of the Opposition is to oppose. Mr Baldwin in 1936 passed legislation to provide a salary of 2000*l.* a year from the public funds to the Leader for the time being of the official Opposition, because he is considered to be discharging a great public duty when he criticises and opposes the Government on all occasions. Absurd as this may appear to Fascists or Nazis, constant keen criticism is considered under the Parliamentary system to be of great value ; for what divides us as party men is far less than what unites us as countrymen.

There is an English philosophy shared by all three Parties. It teaches the supreme importance of the individual, and therefore flatly denies the Fascist standard of values. Signor Mussolini writes of Fascism : ' Anti-individualistic, the Fascist conception of life stresses the importance of the State, and accepts the individual only in so far as his interests coincide with those of the State, which stands for the conscience and universal will of man as an historic entity.' This aggrandisement of the State is a natural reaction in a country which only attained geographical unity in the nineteenth century and was for many years afterwards the prey of internecine political strife. In a country like England, where unity is 1000 years old and where even amongst politicians differences seldom go deep enough to affect personal relations, any such exaltation of the State appears to be confusing the means with the end. The purpose of the State is so to organise and regulate society that the individual is able to live the good life. We Europeans are sometimes inclined to criticise Americans because so many of them devote their whole lives to the accumulation of wealth without ever pausing to wonder what to do with the wealth they already have. We Englishmen feel that Fascists have fallen into a comparable

error ; they seek to increase the power of Italy without ever pausing to ask what good that power is going to do either to Italy or to the Italian people.

The political freedom to which Englishmen have attached so much importance throughout the centuries has changed in forms, but it has on the whole increased steadily in scope. The greatest difficulty in applying it has arisen in the economic sphere. With the growth of a complex society, the liberty of the individual to do as he will with his own—be it land, money, or movable property—may very easily result in an injury or a restriction on the liberty of others. Most of the restrictions on liberty which exist in England can be justified on this ground, which is expressed in Roman law by the maxim *sic utere tuo ut alieno non lædas*. Amongst the liberties which Englishmen most cherish is the liberty of the press. This is not to be defended on the ground that every journal invariably uses its liberty aright, but rather on the ground that no body—and certainly not the Government—is fit to exercise a censorship wisely.

What the Conservative seeks to conserve, then, is the English way of life. He attaches supreme importance to his countrymen's political freedom, but he believes it is assured and not diminished if the executive possesses the powers necessary to rule effectively. Because the Tory Party is older than the Industrial Revolution, it has never admitted that industry and commerce could wisely be left free from governmental direction. The Conservative conceives of the nation as a body in which the different organs should perform their duly allotted task for the good of the whole. That is why on the one hand he does not admit the right of an industrialist to mismanage his own business in his own way, nor on the other hand does he attach much practical importance to egalitarian theories. For the same reason the Conservative attaches a greater importance to agriculture than purely economic considerations would warrant. He respects local traditions and even prejudices, and is reluctant to supersede charitable and social organisations which are the spontaneous work of the people by more efficient and economical official administration. He sees in national games like League football, in national sports like horse-racing, and in national frailties like

beer-drinking recreations which tend to add savour and interest to life, and are therefore in themselves valuable. He is optimist enough to think this way of life fairly good and pessimist enough to disbelieve the promises of earthly Utopias on Communist or Nazi principles. He believes that national unity has already produced something far better than the dictatorship of the proletariat can offer; he has rejected the Nazi creed of race and takes pride in having extended to British subjects of all colours the rights historically won by his countrymen for themselves. While the Englishman could hardly be called religious, he knows that his civilisation is founded on Christianity, and the Conservative sees in the Church of England those qualities of compromise, tolerance, and adaptability which seem to him the greater part of wisdom.

In foreign affairs it is less easy to explain present policy by reference to any long-established British and Conservative tradition, but without some reference to history the English outlook cannot be understood. In the first place, the British are a law-abiding people. As far back as the twelfth century the judges began to travel through the country administering justice, and largely owing to this system, which has continued without interruption to the present day, the law has come to be increasingly respected. The General Strike of 1926 was killed by the legal opinion of Sir John Simon that it was a breach of the law. The suggestion that they were engaged in an illegal conspiracy came as a complete surprise to the trades union leaders and shocked them in all their British and conservative prejudices. Englishmen want to see the same respect shown to international law by sovereign States as they themselves show to their municipal law. Duelling in England was abolished long ago. It was made illegal as soon as public opinion had come to regard it as silly. Resort to the arbitrament of war for the settlement of international disputes is repellent to the British people for the same reasons; they regard it as a wasteful and childish way of proceeding and as an entirely ineffective method of determining what is right. It is only in the last four years that they have come to realise with a shock that three powerful nations do not take the same view.

English Conservatives have always felt a reluctance

to participate in the wars of Europe. With an insular disposition to regard all foreigners as unreasonable people, they dislike the idea of expending blood and treasure over the drawing of some international boundary or other in which they are not interested. Since 1918 public opinion has been becoming increasingly critical of the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles, and so Germany has enjoyed a considerable measure of sympathy. Italy and Italians have always been popular in England, and therefore Italian claims, which it is more difficult to justify on general principles of justice, were not judged as harshly as they otherwise would have been. All these considerations, but chiefly the horror of the waste and destruction of war, have tended to make the Conservative Party and the British people profoundly pacific. Since we have won every war, except the American War of Independence, that we have fought for the last 250 years, we feel now entitled to be pacifists without incurring the charge of cowardice. This is the justification for the British Prime Minister's policy of appeasement.

There is, however, a growing opinion in Britain that this outlook cannot be maintained in view of tendencies in world affairs. It is beginning to appear that we are in the midst of one of the great periodical disturbances making for a repartition of the world. Germany, Italy, and Japan all appear to have ambitions which it would be difficult to satisfy without encroaching upon the territory of the British and French Empires and altering completely the balance of power. At the same time there appears to be a tendency to exalt in all countries the rule of a single man or a party, with its accompanying intolerance and suppression of freedom. The maintenance of these Empires is not therefore primarily a defence of material possessions, but rather the preservation of freedom and toleration and the liberal view of life.

Nor are the totalitarian governments inclined to tolerate free institutions and a free press even in other countries. Dictators appear to be sensitive to criticism in a way which we tougher democratic politicians find difficult to understand, and they resent comments by foreign newspapers on their actions. They are now claiming that their political philosophy must be propagated throughout the world. Signor Mussolini said in

1930 : 'Fascism is on the agenda in all countries, feared in this country, hated implacably in that, and elsewhere invoked with ardour. The phrase "Fascism is not an article for export" is not mine. To-day I affirm that Fascism as an idea, a doctrine, a realisation is universal.' Similarly, six years later Herr Hitler said : 'I do not believe there can be peace among nations until they all have the same law and system of law. That is why I hope that National Socialism will one day extend over the whole world. This is no fantastic dream but an achievable object.' It is claims like these which threaten to provoke a struggle between rival philosophies.

So far as Germany is concerned, there is nothing new in the pan-German movement, which can indeed be traced back to the reign of the Great Elector in the seventeenth century. Both France and England were slow to recognise the signs of its revival in Germany, and considerations of justice and a love of peace made them reluctant to take any steps in the early stages. The year 1938 has seen the German annexation of Austria and the Sudetenland. Politically, at any rate, the pan-German dream of Mitteleuropa under domination of the Reich appears to have been achieved. That this should have happened is undoubtedly a diplomatic reverse for France and England, but in the long run it is a far more serious menace to Italy.

Political realism compels English Conservatives to recognise this *fait accompli*. All of them reconcile themselves to it, some with cheerful alacrity, some with bitter reluctance. The imperialist school has always wished to concentrate politically and economically upon developing our relations with the Empire, the United States of America, and the other new countries. As Europe, which has caused us so much anxiety and loss in the past, appears to sink under German domination, so are they disposed to turn their eyes across the seas. The Anglo-American Trade Agreement may mark a great reorientation of our policy. In almost every way there is more in common between an Englishman and an American than between an Englishman and an European. Our industrial and financial organisation, our standard of life, our conception of international relations, our common language and law are all reasons for closer economic and

political co-operation. It is also an indisputable fact that the relative economic importance of Europe in the world is declining. With freer trade across the seas with our Empire and the two Americas, we hope it may be possible to build up and preserve that economic strength which will enable us to outlive, and if attacked to defend ourselves against, the totalitarian Powers and their cult of economic self-sufficiency.

Englishmen, and especially Conservatives, have always hankered after a policy of detachment from Europe and yet they have never been able to pursue it for long. Will the policy succeed any better now? Munich seemed to offer a prospect of a stabilisation of the status quo in Western Europe, which is Britain's requirement, in return for the free hand in Eastern Europe which Germany insisted on. Probably the majority of English Conservatives would have been satisfied with this arrangement, and certainly after Munich Britain no longer has any opportunity of contesting Germany's free hand in the east. It is less certain that Germany is willing to leave Western Europe undisturbed, and public opinion in England is becoming increasingly anxious.

Britain is hardly less concerned to maintain the status quo in the Mediterranean, and this at once raises the question of Italy's foreign policy, which remains to us a mystery. With the end of 1938 it is obvious that Italian influence in central and south-eastern Europe has practically ended. Germany bestrides the whole continent like a colossus. It would therefore seem that if Fascist Italy must live dangerously and expansively, the Mediterranean is the area where she will seek to extend her power. It had appeared to us that she would wish to associate herself with England and France to maintain an effective balance of power in Europe. Unfortunately there are few indications to show that she has that in mind. The intervention in Spain on behalf of General Franco was clearly undertaken for strategic and not for ideological reasons. Fascism, unlike Nazism, has never until the last few months believed in a world-wide campaign against Communism. On the contrary, as far back as 1924 Fascist Italy recognised the Soviet Government and concluded a commercial agreement with it; as recently as 1933 she

concluded a non-aggression pact with Russia. It is apparent therefore that Italy's purpose was to obtain a dominant position in the Western Mediterranean.

The desire to be on friendly terms with Italy is almost universal in Britain, but there is great difference of opinion as to whether this is possible. The Prime Minister showed his hope and faith when he concluded the Anglo-Italian Agreement in April 1938. He was not able to bring it into force until November because the Italian Government had not fulfilled the conditions upon fulfilment of which its entry into force was dependent. This seemed to prove that Italy prefers military expansion in the Mediterranean to friendship with Britain. If this is indeed the case, then a collision in that sea between the two Powers is probable.

The English Conservative is therefore left uncertain as to his country's future relations with both Germany and Italy. Munich and the Anglo-Italian Agreement were Mr Chamberlain's attempt to meet the aspirations of the totalitarian Powers. They were approved by a majority of the country and of the Conservative Party as being measures which carried the principle of conciliation far, but not further than was justified for the cause of peace. A resolute minority of the Party, like the two Oppositions, denounced both agreements as surrenders which were less likely to satisfy old demands than to encourage new ones. The underlying suspicion that this policy of appeasement would not by itself succeed led to the simultaneous intensification of rearmament. Britain hopes that Germany and Italy are now satisfied Powers and share her wish for peace, but she is preparing resolutely for war.

ADDENDUM

The German annexation of Bohemia and Moravia in March and the Italian occupation of Albania in April have demonstrated that the belief in the moderation and good faith of the totalitarian Powers was ill-founded. It therefore destroyed the whole basis upon which the Government's policy of appeasement had rested; it justified all the criticisms that had been made both by the Opposition Parties and dissident Conservatives. The Government have recognised the logic of the situation

and have completely reversed their policy. Historians will probably wonder that so complete and revolutionary a change could have been made so suddenly and without any change in the membership of the Government.

The Prime Minister has stated that the present conditions are not those of peace. Recognising that Europe is engaged in a war with only the killing left out, the Government has adopted war measures both in diplomacy and defence. Britain has begun to build up a coalition in Europe against aggression, as in the Napoleonic Wars, and trade agreements and credits take the place of the old-fashioned subsidies. The guarantees given to Poland, Rumania, and Greece correspond to wartime alliances in the past, but if they could rightly be regarded as a peacetime measure, they would be the very negation of the traditional policy of Britain and more particularly of the Tory Party. The setting up of a Ministry of Supply and the introduction of conscription are the necessary reflection in the sphere of defence of the new foreign policy. The new measures of air-raid precautions organised by local authorities indicate a return to mediæval conditions when each locality had to be responsible for its own defences. In these new circumstances, there is likely to be even less difference between the Parties than there has been before. The Government have adopted the foreign policy of their opponents and will find themselves increasingly obliged to bring industry under a national system of planning; the Oppositions will find themselves obliged to give support to the Government in its rearmament and foreign policy. Britain has therefore to thank the aggression of the dictatorships for a display of energy from the nation and of unity amongst the politicians which even wars have not always produced in the past.

HUGH MOLSON.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- Cambridge Ancient History, XII.**
A History of Europe. Henri Pirenne.
The Evolution of the British Empire. Sir John Marriott.
The Sword of Light. Desmond Ryan.
The Golden Middle Age. Roger Lloyd.
The History of the London County Council, 1889-1939. Sir Gwilym Gibbon and Reginald W. Bell.
Middlesex. The Jubilee of the County Council. C. W. Radcliffe.
London Worthies. William Kent.
Security: Can We Retrieve it? Sir Arthur Salter.
The British Cabinet System, 1830-1938. Arthur Berriedale Keith.
Prices and Wages in England. Sir William Beveridge.
British Shipping. R. H. Thornton.
Regent of Hungary. Owen Rutter.
Lord Redesdale. The Hon. Evelyn Mitford.
Oriental Assembly. T. E. Lawrence.
Spirit and Reality. Nicolas Berdyaev.
The State and the Soul. St John Ervine.
Arnold Bennett. Georges Lafourcade.
George Meredith and His German Critics. Guy B. Petter.
Induction to Tragedy. Howard Baker.
The Small Town in American Literature. Ima Honaker Herron.
Portrait of Stella Benson. R. Ellis Roberts.
Johnsonian Gleanings, IX. Aleyn Lyell Reade.
Passionate Kensington. Rachel Ferguson.
Dr Arne. Hubert Langley.
The Dream World. R. L. Mégroz.
The Handbook of British Birds, III.

SIXTEEN years have gone since the first volume of the 'Cambridge Ancient History' was published by that University Press. The plan in the beginning was to complete the series in eight volumes; but, in fact, it has required twelve full rich books, with five supplementary volumes of illustrative plates. The work throughout has been prepared and written with elaborate care by many, and with a lavish provision of maps and plans. As to its scholarly, its historical appeal, can it be called brilliant? It is not quite needless to ask the question, for it enables us rather to celebrate a triumph of effective teamwork than any such glittering brightness of narrative and personal characterisations as has sometimes marked a clever individual, who could play on ascertained facts with imaginative improvisations which, of course, might easily be unreliable. Doubtless here and there, as we pointed out in an earlier criticism of this great series, there have been almost inevitable partialities and mistaken judgments; but as a whole the History from its beginning among the golden barbarities of Egypt and

Babylonia to its end with the building of Constantinople is earnest in the endeavours of its writers to describe truly the world as it was in the ancient days until it was merged into the new age that afterwards was called mediæval. To read the names and credentials of the contributors as listed in this last volume alone, and they are specialists in their subjects and brought from sundry universities of Europe and the New World, is to realise the extraordinary scope of this History. Great is the word for its aim and the achievement, which again mark further the courage and devotion to learning of the University from whose inspiration and Press it has come.

'A History of Europe' (Allen and Unwin), by the late Professor Henri Pirenne, is a work of outstanding quality, not only for its considerate survey of the changes and settlements on the Continent from the invasions of the barbarians to the sixteenth century, but for the moral heroism of which it is a result. During the War M. Pirenne was arrested suddenly and wantonly at his home in Belgium and incarcerated in prison-camps in Germany. To make that misery less intolerable he set himself the task of lecturing on history to his fellow-prisoners and of preparing for this work by taking such notes then as were possible and setting in order the wealth of historical knowledge that he had absorbed. Here it is published by his son as a labour of love, but also it is a valuable asset to scholars and libraries. Incidentally, where M. Pirenne comes to the development of Capitalism he has inserted a footnote saying that there he needed his books and notes before saying anything definite of that branch of his subject. The volume shows few of such shortcomings. Treating of so vast a theme as Europe from the days of the barbarians to the time of the Tudors—the intention was to carry it on to 1914, but the historian's death prevented that—has necessarily permitted only a most general survey: yet so brilliant were M. Pirenne's knowledge and powers (and the skill of his translator) that the reader gets a clear and sufficient impression of the individualities, movements, and ever-changing times that are brought within its compass. And what mighty and dramatic movements and times those were! It is impossible fairly to epitomise this work, it being indeed in itself one bold and vivid epitome.

The wrath of Attila ; the rise of Byzantium ; the works of Justinian, of Gregory the Great, of Augustine and Charlemagne ; the settlement of the Franks, the quarrel between the Empire and the Papacy ; Islam and the Holy War which drivelled out in weakening crusades ; Barbarossa ; the Great Schism ; and so to the fundamental changes in civilisation which came with the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the growth of Capitalism. It is a colossal story in which, if there are any inadequacies in M. Pirenne's work, they are surely justified through the heroic spirit that went to its writing.

Former Oxford undergraduates, who in days gone by enjoyed Sir John Marriott's lectures in the History School probably more than any others, can now, year by year, rediscover that enjoyment in his books. The secret is that he has an eminent gift for telling the reader what he wants to know in plain and concise language without frills, affectations, eccentricities, obscurities, or purple patches. His latest book, '**The Evolution of the British Empire**' (Nicholson and Watson), is an excellent example of these qualities. We are given the how, when, and why of the development of our imperial system. How did civilisation in America begin ? What were the characteristics of the various States there ? Why did they revolt ? Why did some Australian States clamour for fewer and some for more convicts ? Why is New Zealand considered more like England than any other Dominion ? What has caused the continued English-Dutch friction in South Africa ? The partition of Africa, Colonial federation, the World War, the post-War Empire, Dominion status, inter-Imperial relations, and the Government of India are some of the subjects notably dealt with, and the book ends with an excellent chapter on Retrospect and Prospect.

Mr Desmond Ryan's volume on the revival and eventual triumph of the Irish language, the '**Hidden Ireland**' which had been kept alive in the people's hearts, published under the poetical title of '**The Sword of Light**' (Arthur Barker), would be entirely charming if it were not for the small and bitter touches due to the politics, otherwise dead, which here and there are allowed to creep in. No one of decent mind in England grudges the success which has followed the efforts made by

Dr Douglas Hyde and his predecessors to revive the use of Gaelic in Ireland or any other of the constructive efforts made there; and, therefore, it is a pity that, as this book reveals, hatred of England in that other island, which never was John Bull's, should so persist. After England and the Irish Protestant Church, Mr Ryan shows his poor love (so to speak) for Daniel O'Connell. But let us forget the blemishes in this work and appreciate its qualities, which best appear in the charm of the style, which must be credited to the culture of a language other than Irish. Mr Ryan's studies of Philip Barron, of the Brooke father and daughter, and of John O'Donovan are witty and well said, while the whole book reveals the devotions to their purpose not only of the enthusiasts but also of the eccentrics who seem to be essential to the fortunes of most true causes.

Much scholarship has been given in recent years to the study of the Middle Ages and has found lasting expression in excellent books. A fascinating period, which does not lend itself to rule-of-thumb or unimaginative treatment, its events and chief personalities invite and merit the interested attention—with many conjectures—which they are securing. Canon Roger Lloyd, who modestly asserts that he is only an amateur in history and that his work '*The Golden Middle Age*' (Longmans) is merely a labour of love, a holiday task, has yet served a useful purpose in bringing together certain religious and philosophical characteristics of the twelfth century, mainly summarised from recent works of authority. It is, of course, not deep and there are omissions; but a student who has not read Owst, Bennett, Oman, Coulton, and others who have done much to renew the life with the movements, causes, and systems of the mediæval renaissance, as in many ways it was, will find it well described and summarised herein. As his title suggests, Canon Lloyd sees the better side of the Middle Ages, and certainly his favourite century had in its persons and ideals elements of greatness. But was it really, beyond the other centuries of that period, 'golden'?

The London County Council has come to its Jubilee and is entitled to celebrate the event with pride. Whatever charitable thoughts may now be spent on the old Metropolitan Board of Works, which, to say the least of

it, had proved unequal to its task, there is no doubt that the institution in its place of the new governing body for the County of all London—and supreme except for the cherished City, the 'one square mile,' with its ancient and honoured Corporation—not only brought far-reaching reforms and a new impetus to the Metropolis but set a brilliant example to other parts of these islands wherever the municipal government then required to be speeded. For one thing, Bumble went, while there was soon a new efficiency, energy, and social kindness everywhere, and continuing; results for which the L.C.C. is entitled to much credit. 'The History of the London County Council, 1889-1939' (Macmillan), written by Sir Gwilym Gibbon and Mr Reginald W. Bell, recalls the earlier days of muddle and prejudice; and one who was a witness to the event, with the calm spirit that historical distance brings, may pay tribute to those Progressives who, although they did 'snap' the earliest election, acted by fresh civic ideals and laid the foundations of the unquestioned and remarkable success which is now recognised and praised. The addition to it later of the School Board, through which the main responsibility for elementary and technical education in London was thrust upon the Council, was serious, and at first it looked as if it might endanger its other duties. But time shows that this intelligent colossus successfully absorbed its mountain with further burdens—fire brigade, sewerage, and what-not—and so it goes on; the Local Parliament of London, employing many thousands of workers and looking with keenness after the health, well-being, and safety—with the entertainments also—of the millions of Londoners. It is a fine record, and this handsome volume is its worthy 'remembrancer.'

In a similar manner, at this Jubilee, the County Council for Middlesex may also well be proud of its record of fifty years. It has sponsored the production and publication of a work entitled 'Middlesex—The Jubilee of the County Council' (Evans Brothers), by Mr C. W. Radcliffe, Clerk to the Council. Middlesex must be unique among counties in many ways. It is small, yet very important. It is altogether overshadowed by its neighbour London, but has a vigorous life of its own. It has its guildhall and offices in another county. For

its size it has had far more open land swallowed up in building than any other county, and is now hard pressed to keep any countryside within its borders. Its rural amenities have thus decreased in proportion as its rateable value (now 20,000,000*l.* per annum) has increased. The decrease in fields and lanes has been no less marked than the increase in schools, hospitals, institutions, places of amusement, bridges, and modern roads produced by the enterprise of its County Council. Special efforts have been made over the Green Belt—and yet how entirely inadequate the results of those laudable efforts have been no one who drives through the county can doubt. That, however, is not the fault of the Council. As a nation we profess to love the countryside more than other nations: yet in practice we destroy it more ruthlessly, more consistently, and more untidily than anywhere else. Mr Radcliffe in his well arranged and fully illustrated work gives a most interesting account of the history and administration of the county as well as of the services included in that administration, and of the conditions and prospects of success in those services.

Mr William Kent is well known as a London enthusiast, and his reputation is strengthened by his '**London Worthies**' (Heath Cranton). In it he has collected 350 biographies of men and women eminent for their good qualities or otherwise. We are told that the selection includes poets, preachers, philosophers, and a pill-maker; novelists, cricketers, criminals, artists, antiquaries, eccentrics, misers, fanatics, hangmen, and Hyde Park orators. It is, of course, pleasant to find Byron, Walter Scott, and Shelley among London Worthies, though perhaps their claim to that distinction is but moderately well founded. If Thomas Cubitt is rightly included, we think that John Nash might also have had a place, and with Mr Herbert Morrison, the present leader of the L.C.C., we think that Lord Rosebery, its first chairman, might well have been included. However, it is always easy, though not very profitable, to detect gaps. On the other hand there is much useful and instructive information in this book, and Londoners can open it anywhere and find something worth their while.

Sir Arthur Salter's '**Security: Can We Retrieve it?**' (Macmillans) is a most superior book—superior in style

and tone, superior in the wisdom, experience, and the ability of the author, superior almost to the point of being pontifical in its judgments and of being patronising in its distribution of praise and blame to statesmen and others. If Sir Arthur had written with the authority of one who had held Cabinet office in these difficult years, he might possibly have had more sympathy with the errors which are so patent to the Independent Member for Oxford University. It is only fair to add that Sir Arthur's survey of the present state of Europe and of recent years is done with the clearness we have learned to expect from him, and far from being merely a destructive critic he offers many able constructive suggestions. Some of his readers will feel that he does but scant justice to the Prime Minister, and may even feel convinced that his (the Prime Minister's) line of policy is more likely to be successful in the end even than Sir Arthur's hitherto untried proposals. In these days when so many violently expressed and heavily purple-patched works on Europe are published to excite the public's jaded palate, it is a relief to turn to a dignified and scholarly book like this, which is worth reading whether one agrees or not with all the views expressed in it.

If democracy is to justify itself, as it is going to do in spite of the challenges and misrepresentations of advocates of other governmental ideals, it should abide by the counsel of the Greek philosopher and know itself, while also incidentally understanding the causes of its development and how its administrative instruments have come to be. A useful and interesting volume to that end has been published by Dr Arthur Berriedale Keith, which explains aptly and yet comprehensively 'The British Cabinet System, 1830-1938' (Stevens). It is brought up to the autumn of last year and therefore infringes upon questions over which we still are anxious and still must be anxious so long as an iron wolfishness threatens in Central Europe. Dr Keith begins his account of our supreme governmental system from two years before the Reforms of 1832, and shows how with certain extensions of the franchise, which would make even the old reformers, or most of them, turn in their graves, the authority of the House of Commons has strengthened, with that of the Cabinet and of the Prime Minister, whose

scope and responsibilities could not have been even fantastically dreamed of by the most imaginative of his Victorian predecessors. Simultaneously with that, the authority of the Crown has changed. It is at once greater through its especial association with the equal partners of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and less through the strengthened authority of Ministers. But the Cabinet is the principal concern of this volume, and we see how it has developed and worked; what the Privy Council is, and what it does, and of the relations of the Ministry with Parliament. This is no dry book. It is written with verve and pungency. Personal values are frequently estimated, and that of the present Prime Minister is shrewdly gauged; so that it is not only a work for specialists but for that highly appreciated reader known as Everyman.

The thoroughness over averages and statistics of our scientifically ordered times is illustrated by the abundant volume on 'Prices and Wages in England' (Longmans) which, under the superintendence of Sir William Beveridge, has been compiled by a number of skilled and trustworthy people. Sir William's only serious predecessor in this important department of enquiry was Thorold Rogers, whose investigations, although they began with the thirteenth century, ended before the nineteenth century began, and therefore missed the whole of the modern age except for its chaotic beginnings under the new Industrialism. The purpose of this and the succeeding volumes in a series is to present a history of prices and wages in England from the twelfth to and including the nineteenth century, as part of a co-ordinated scheme of parallel studies in other countries. How far-reaching, how tremendous that co-ordinated series will be is briefly suggested by this vast instalment, which treats mainly of price tables and the history of prices. It certainly has its interest for many, and doubtless its fascination for the social historian. Taking the accounts in bills and account-books of such institutions as Winchester School, Eton, Westminster School and the Abbey, Charterhouse, Greenwich and Chelsea Hospitals, the Lord Steward's department, which manages the creature-comforts of the Royal households, and the Lord Chamberlain's, which attends generally to their outward appearances, as well as the Office of Works and the Victualling

and Stores departments of the Navy, we have presented to us in orderly sequence, sometimes in special cases photographed, in other cases laboriously copied from the old documents and tabulated, all manner of household and other information—from the provisioning of the Armada (and earlier) to the fodder supplied to the stables of Charles II, and such everyday details as the periodical requirements of loaves, coal, and solder and “two-penny to forty-penny nails.” Only a comparatively small part of this work is given to description; but there are enough details here to gratify the curious who are willing to delve for it for possibly a life-time or two.

Mr R. H. Thornton, in the first words of his book on ‘**British Shipping**’ (Cambridge University Press), endeavours, he confesses, to forestall his critics with excuses. He need not have felt diffidence. His volume is excellent of its kind, full, practical, clear, and often bright with humour and amusing touches. It is the story of our mercantile marine, roughly in the last hundred years, from the old steam-packets, that used their sails as well as their engine-power, to the modern luxury liners which in the face of ever-increasing competition and expenses have difficulty in making a profit. He brings out the truth that as essential as any class of vessels in the British merchant navy are the tramps that go everywhere, picking up a living and sometimes dividends with the cheeriness that is characteristic of the sailors who man them; though surly and unsympathetic as sometimes the trade of the seas may be. The tasks of the ship-owners have not been easy at any time, especially since the pre-War rivalry of the Germans—to whom Mr Thornton rightly gives honour, for they ‘shared almost all our virtues and some of our faults’—who challenged our supremacy as we had challenged and beaten that of America a hundred years before. At present, while Great Britain has still the greatest share of the world’s tonnage, she has less than that of her rivals put together. So that the word ‘subsidy’ has now a rising significance, and things are very different from their conditions when, through Free Trade, there were bumper cargoes most of the time. Mr Thornton rightly, and unexpectedly, reduces the late Samuel Plimsoll to his proper place. The impression has been generally

accepted that without his hull-line there would be a terrible loss of ships. The coffin ship, at its worst, was most rare ; while traffic on the sea seems actually to have been safer than it is on land. During the last fourteen years, out of the many hundreds of thousands of passengers annually travelling in British ships, an average of only thirteen a year have been drowned. That is the result of care and efficiency. It is amusing, in contrast with the slickness with which the work of the ships is now done, to recall the launching of Brunel's famous 'Great Eastern' in 1857. The vessel was christened. After a breathless pause she moved three and a half inches. After an adjournment for lunch, the effort was repeated, but she would not move at all. Repeated attempts got her in the next three months to move no more than sixty feet, and then she launched herself unaided on an unusually high spring-tide.

Despite the very prominent position that he has held for years in Hungary, that ancient kingdom which geographically and politically may be regarded as the hub of Europe, the work and personality of Admiral Horthy, 'Regent of Hungary' (Rich and Cowan), are strangely little known to the British people. So that Mr Owen Rutter's account of his career is largely a revelation. The author, while always a loyal Briton, at the same time sympathises warmly with Hungary and shows how inevitable it is after the inordinate difficulties she has overcome, generally through the Admiral's foresight and decision, to have become a close associate of Germany and Italy, while still retaining a warm liking for the British and their ideals. Horthy's career has been remarkable and remarkably modest. The son of a land-owner, he joined the Austro-Hungarian navy, whose uniform, although that navy now is extinct, he continues on formal occasions to wear. He did brilliantly in the War, although against the powerful Italian fleet his few ships were worse than inadequate ; and, when the defeat for the Central Powers brought chaos and Bolshevism to his country, was clearly the only man to put its house into order. In this heavy task, now accomplished, he was hampered by the rashness of the exiled Emperor Charles, who twice endangered his old kingdom through futile coups d'état.

In the concluding pages of her life of her grandfather's great-uncle, 'Lord Redesdale' (Longmans), the late Evelyn Mitford confesses to the difficulty a kinswoman has in appraising his value impartially. If she has erred on the side of sympathy it is on this occasion a fault commendable. Redesdale lived at an especially difficult period in Anglo-Irish history, and with great reluctance on his part was appointed the Lord Chancellor of Ireland immediately after the Union, when difficulties were thick and new crops of rebellious troubles arising. He fulfilled his duties with efficiency and clemency, and although in gentle irony Miss Mitford declares that, in the troubles between England and Ireland, 'Paddy is always a gentle, harmless, unarmed creature; a persecuted, haloed saint; a victim to the villainies of that accursed horned devil, John Bull,' it is a fact that two of Ireland's national heroes, Grattan and Emmet, paid tribute to the mildness of the administration in Redesdale's time. As the chief part of his life was spent in Ireland, this volume comprises an important chapter of the history of the relations of that island with England. The story is freshly and fairly told; but on the whole it makes sad reading, as any narrative of the events of those dreadful years must be. This, however, is sure, that if all the statesmen on both sides, and including George III, who were concerned with the Irish question at that time had possessed the reasonableness and sense of justice that were shown by the first Lord Redesdale, the Act of Union might never have been repealed.

Lawrence of Arabia has reached the greatness which makes even the smallest details about him interesting. Although his career was a triumph of reality, it also had legendary aspects which, doubtless, will grow as the years pass and the truth and romance of his achievements are increasingly talked about. His brother, Mr A. W. Lawrence, has strengthened the true story by putting together 'Oriental Assembly' (Williams and Norgate). This consists of the diary kept by Lawrence during a journey made in the region of the Euphrates in 1911, together with two brilliant articles republished: the first on the Changing East, in which he shows the subtle differences there are between Europeans and the peoples of the Orient, with the amazing alterations that have

come to Asia since the War; the second an account of his strategy and shifts when leading the Arabs, almost bloodlessly, against the Turks. We also are given the suppressed introductory chapter to the 'Seven Pillars of Wisdom,' and Lawrence's many photographs of Arabia and its tribes and fighters. It cannot be said that the revelations in this volume are vastly new; but they help to fill in the portrait of the man, his ideas and ideals, and incidentally reveal the determination of his spirit; for, as the diary shows, he suffered weaknesses and many faintings in the journey wherein he studied the ancient strongholds in the desert that were then his particular archæological interest.

Once again Professor Nicolas Berdyaev has contributed to the solving of problems that deeply concern mankind and yet in the everyday hubbub of events are often overlooked. In his new volume on 'Spirit and Reality' (Bles) he begins with an acceptance of the truth that while the world refuses to doubt the reality of immediately perceptible phenomena, many people being so easily gullible, it tends to deny the reality of spirit. Yet that is surely an essential constituent of the human personality, a primal cause of the creative impulse, influencing man in ways the reverse of those which tend to materialism. He sees the changes caused after some time in manifestations of the spirit. The Christian revelation, he claims—and who can dispute it?—is unrecognisable in historical Christianity—there is little of St Francis in Franciscanism, Luther has been deformed in the history of Protestantism, and even Karl Marx no longer stands for his principles in the light of the subsequent Marxism; examples which show how the quality roughly called relativity may affect even the supposedly changeless essentials. Professor Berdyaev enters into deep regions and others to which no plumb-line has yet reached; but always he remains, unlike many philosophers, in touch with humanity. His theories are not mere abstractions, but have concern with mankind, our very selves; and again his contribution to thought and truth has proved positively helpful.

Mr St John Ervine in his Essex Hall Lecture for this year treats that same general question in his individual way, and shows how especially necessary is the spiritual

to these materialistic times. His is a protest that is happily becoming frequent, showing that the more thoughtful are rebelling against the over-effects of mechanical efficiency. In 'The State and the Soul' (Lindsey Press) he reminds us of the astonishing progress made through inventions which before the War were unthought of or were little more than shadowy dreams; and we see that although in the meantime the standard of comfort has risen considerably it has been accompanied by a general lessening of human freedom and in some places a growth of tyranny, political and industrial. Wisely he begins with certain canons of Liberal doctrine, sound human principles that once were considered as almost divinely laid down, their spokesmen being Herbert Spencer, John Morley, and Dr Bury. Where are we now? With all the rush and turmoil, selfishness, and blatant assertions of racial patriotism, combined with persecutions which the fanatics of mediæval times could only admire, is the world happier? We know that it is not; but yet it is not hopeless. Professor Berdyaev and Mr Ervine—who is a vigorous, courageous voice on the side of the angels and Great Britain—point the way to a renewed and better happiness.

It is complimentary to English literature that so many foreign professors of standing have especially studied the characteristics of its authors and their works and printed their conclusions in estimable books. Of those appreciations, M. Georges Lafourcade is second to none, and his study of 'Arnold Bennett' (Muller) is worthy to be set beside his volumes on Swinburne. The question naturally has risen, For how long will Bennett's position among English novelists endure? M. Lafourcade regards him also as a writer of criticisms; but Bennett's later journalistic reviews were so unworthy of his judgment and gifts that he may well be considered solely as a novelist. One thing, at least, is sure, says M. Lafourcade, that he cannot yet be given definitely his proper rank among the four great novelists of the early years of this century—the others being Wells, Galsworthy, and Conrad—but he can afford to wait. We have our doubts over that conclusion. Arnold Bennett deserved his day. His *Matador* and the 'Old Wives Tale' entitled him to an excellent place in literary memory for some time to

come ; but too much of his work was obviously derivative, insufficiently considered, and too uneven and hurried for anything like permanence. Had he written less and less rapidly, he must have done better and possibly thereby realised the freshness and originality that are essential if works of art may live. He served his contemporaries well, and was well rewarded in the ways he desired ; and that probably is all that need be said of it. Yet we are grateful to M. Lafourcade for raising the question and discussing it with discrimination and enlightenment.

Doubtful as we are of any likely recovery of permanence in literature for Arnold Bennett, we feel as sure as is permissible to the frailties of human judgment that George Meredith some day, and it may be soon, will come back, if not to the popularity which he never really attained, yet to the abiding appreciation of an increasing circle of the best-minded readers. This impression is strengthened by a volume, written and compiled by Mr Guy B. Petter, '**George Meredith and His German Critics**' (Witherby), in which we are shown how, although Meredith in his writing days was almost entirely ignored in Germany, readers there have since discovered him and come generally to the decision that he was the greatest English novelist of his time. Somewhat shrouded in that judgment, we discern the opinion that possibly he gave too much trouble to his readers through his style being over-compact and often artificial ; and even, and especially, his admirers must recognise that some of his books or parts of them were strained and untrue to life—'One of Our Conquerors' being for that reason possibly the least read—and that such disadvantages of style and characterisation are bound to limit his future acceptance and greatness. The opinions which Mr Petter has gathered from German reviews are generally acute. They bring out Meredith's qualities of epigrammatic wit and discernment and especially his strong views on human rights ; more especially on the rights of women, over which he was pioneer. They recognise also his appreciation of the moods of the Comic Spirit, that with ironic laughter chides the small importances of men.

From the United States of America comes a volume of deeper probing than the foregoing, and a further instance of the value of the enterprise of their students and pro-

fessors of literature, who have set themselves tasks of research which otherwise would probably not have been essayed. Mr Howard Baker's '*Induction to Tragedy*' (Louisiana State University Press) is an example of such industry, lasting in this case for ten long years. It contains an examination of the development of form, and of the formal elements, in '*Gorboduc*,' '*Titus Andronicus*,' and Kyd's '*Spanish Tragedy*'; and, besides denying the great influence of Seneca in the body of Elizabethan tragedy, discovers how that great expression of genius and passion was the natural child of the mediæval drama. Incidentally, it throws light on the origins and strengthening of blank verse, and discovers how that medium, through which Marlowe wrought his mighty line and Shakespeare found his finished utterance, owed its beginnings here to the Earl of Surrey, who had derived it from Italian inspiration. That the early stages of Elizabethan tragedy were red with carnage and horrors is true enough; but with the orgies of blood came also the ghosts that doubtless thrilled and the clowns who brought laughter to the groundlings, the value of whose support of the stage Shakespeare himself implied. This is primarily a book for students; but it has also elements of entertainment in so far as it recalls those greater utterances of poetic and dramatic appeal which must persist so long as English literature has the power to move.

Written with a similar thoroughness but on a subject utterly different from the foregoing, we find Dr Ima Honaker Herron's study of '*The Small Town in American Literature*,' published under the auspices of the Duke University of North Carolina, to be incidentally a generously comprehensive survey of the vast literary produce of the United States. The small town is by her regarded from its beginnings as a scattering of cottages to such promise of eventual bigness as is represented by its possessing a Main Street of almost Lewis-Sinclair proportions; and within that range we meet writers as far apart in style and time as Nathaniel Hawthorne, Washington Irving, Longfellow, Mark Twain, W. D. Howells, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Mrs Wilkins Freeman, and Edith Wharton; whereby one is rather brought to wonder why in that comprehensiveness Henry James, for

instance, is left out. It is, however, necessary for a British reader to remember that the small American town has always been an intense and richly varied expression of the national spirit. Within its limits it shows something of that larger self-determination combined with an eager local patriotism and individuality, of which qualities no more eloquent example could be found than the 'Spoon River Anthology.' Dr Herron's book is of a kind which requires more personal knowledge with the conditions of American personal life than is generally available here, and the ill feelings caused by Mrs Frances Trollope and Charles Dickens through their outspoken views of it—which evidently still rankle—showed how easily it was and still would be to go astray. It is enough, therefore, to hail this work for the industrious and interesting manner in which a literary sidetrack has been explored.

Readers of Stella Benson were bound to want to know more about her, whose works had such originality, subtlety, and charm, wit, humour, insight, and, at times, earnestness, for a personality emerged from them which baffled. That she enjoyed life in its everyday was clear, as was also the truth that she had anxieties and discontents; but yet she remained to those who could only know her through her writings an attractive enigma. Her heart was not exposed for the idle to peck at. The difficulties about her make Mr R. Ellis Roberts's success in his verbal limning of the 'Portrait of Stella Benson' (Macmillan) the more to be admired. Urged by his friendship with her, which evidently was devoted, he has generally overcome them and achieved a brilliant representation of her in her fantastical and shadowy moods and serious determinings. She had a high sense of duty and gave herself unselfishly, even with challenges, to social causes in places as far from each other as Hoxton and Hong Kong. She had a great love for animals and for the less-befriended and odd of mankind, and with it a chortling, knockabout sense of humour which helped to make her books amusingly distinctive. Mr Roberts has added to the truth of his Portrait by remembering the blemishes and faults which, though faint enough, were there, and therefore necessary to bring out the reality he was seeking. She remains much as she was, with spirit aloof; but through this loveable tribute

we know her better than otherwise would have been possible.

Mr Aleyn Lyell Reade's 'Johnsonian Gleanings' (Percy Lund, Humphries) have come to the ninth part, and with this latest instalment, 'A Further Miscellany,' of a valuable series, its compiler has found it necessary to emit a loud sigh. Mr Reade has endeavoured in the past year to solve many problems about many people in some ways associated with Johnson, but generally, alas, he has failed. A creditable failure, as his list of subjects and these pages show; but there it is. He leaves these questions not too hopefully to the research and discernments of others. Meanwhile, with this volume as a sort of 'bye,' we look forward to his next instalment, which is to carry on the life of the Doctor to 1740, and so bring almost to completion a work of extraordinary devotion and industry and of wide interest to Johnsonians.

Enthusiasm is an excellent quality and the sense of humour an even better possession. Happily Miss Rachel Ferguson has both qualities in such abundance that when a person, named or quoted by her, but who shall be unnamed here, declared that Kensington was his conception of Hell, she pounced on him so effectually that if the brave, poor man has survived her onslaught he deserves the sort of immortality she has given him. For 'Passionate Kensington' (Cape) is at once captivating, compelling, and convincing; while incidentally it provides an example of what local patriotism should be. Miss Ferguson settled in Kensington when she was a child—only the other day: yet she knows it, and its ghosts, walks, shops, and humours, as if she had lived there since the Year One. It is, as every parish or village may be, a microcosm of the big round world, and is especially rich in the institutions people talk about; as Kensington Palace, Addison Road Station, Olympia, the Albert Hall, Holland Park, and, to judge from the importance here given to its wares, Woolworth's. Yet, comparatively speaking, such buildings are mere footstools in Miss Ferguson's progress. She speeds along and shows on her winged way an engaging familiarity with all kinds of persons: clowns, comedians (sensitive over their ages), authors, actors retired and otherwise, cats, and eccentrics. The only persons for whom we could not share her

admiring interest were some of her friends in the shops : but then she has a large and enlightened heart and, even with her illuminative pen to help us, we do not really know those blameless people.

Mr. Hubert Langley writes pleasantly, with a nice dislike of democracy, and such imaginative charm as is shown in the touch about the fairy-time at Eton, where 'Dr Arne' (Cambridge University Press) had his schooling and played his flute to the small thanks of his companions. It is high time a due biography of that imperfect man and fine musician was written, and this is the first helpful attempt yet made to do so by telling the whole truth of Arne's chequered career. It is surprising to discover, remembering the popularity of a few of his Shakespearean songs, how forgotten he has become. Mr Langley reminds us that not one of his single works of primary importance is in print or available in its entirety for the theatre or the concert hall, and justly describes that fact as discreditable. Such neglect will not continue : of that we may feel sure, but doubtless it is partly due to Arne's private and notorious conduct, his brilliant gifts, as proved in his youth, having become debased and lost through debauchery and extravagance.

With estimable courage and patience Mr R. L. Mégroz has gathered from all manner of sources, ancient and modern, accounts of dreams with theories as to their causes. It is an earnest endeavour to treat scientifically one of the most evasive and illimitable of subjects ; and if in his work 'The Dream World' (Lane) he has hardly established more firmly than hitherto the foundations of this study, we still must feel admiration for the endeavour that he has made. Possibly the belief that dreams are nothing more than the imaginative mind taking holiday in the half-sleep and going adventuring of its own unhampered accord is the nearest approach to the truth of it ; but the revelations of dreams—if revelations is the word—have been generally so varied, subtle, and gloriously inconsequent that it has been natural for those who experiment in the occult to attempt to force from them at times more than is available. That is not to say that Mr Mégroz's industry or book have been wasted. Far from that, for the dreams that he describes at least are entertaining.

We conclude with Messrs Witherby's '**Handbook of British Birds,**' which has come to its third volume. The conscientious reviewer finds himself a little at a loss as to what that is fresh can be said of this newcomer to a fine series. It treats in detail the large and important families of Hawks, Eagles, Geese, and Ducks ; with such species as those of the Spoonbill, Heron, and Swan intervening. There is little of the merely anecdotal in this volume—unlike its immediate predecessor, which had the baffling and cunning ways of the Cuckoo to tell to the curious ; but being pre-eminently a scientific work it fulfils its true function in describing the habitats, field character and general habits, voice, display and postures, breeding-habits, food, and distribution at home and abroad of its numerous examples ; the whole being helpfully illustrated with diagrams and coloured plates. Amongst these last a special reference is due to Mr Peter Scott, not only for his admirable drawings of the many species of British geese, but also for his generosity in presenting to the publishers the rights of their reproduction in this work.

